Edited by Annette Arlander, Bruce Barton, Melanie Dreyer-Lude, Ben Spatz

Performance as Research

KNOWLEDGE, METHODS, IMPACT

ROUTLEDGE

Performance as Research

Performance as Research (PAR) is characterised by an extraordinary elasticity and interdisciplinary drive. *Performance as Research: Knowledge, Methods, Impact* celebrates this energy, bringing together chapters from a wide range of disciplines and eight different countries. This volume focuses explicitly on three critical, often contentious themes that run through much discussion of PAR as a discipline:

- Knowledge – the areas and manners in which performance can generate knowledge;
- Methods – methods and methodologies for approaching performance as research;
- Impact – a broad understanding of the impact of this form of research.

These themes are framed by four essays from the book's editors, contextualising their interrelated conversations, teasing out common threads, and exploring the new questions that the contributions pose to the field of performance. As both an intervention into and extension of current debates, this is a vital collection for any reader concerned with the value and legitimacy of performance as research.

Annette Arlander is an artist, researcher, and pedagogue. She is currently principal investigator of the research project How to Do Things with Performance? and engaged in the project Performing with Plants.

Bruce Barton is a creator/scholar, Artistic Director of the interdisciplinary performance hub Vertical City, and Director of the School of Creative and Performing Arts, University of Calgary.

Melanie Dreyer-Lude is a director, actor, producer, and teacher. She is a resident producing artist at Civic Ensemble, Ithaca, and an Assistant Professor in the Department of Theatre and Dance, Missouri University.

Ben Spatz is author of *What a Body Can Do: Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research* and editor of the videographic *Journal of Embodied Research*. They are currently Senior Lecturer in Drama, Theatre and Performance at University of Huddersfield.


Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Performance as Research

Knowledge, Methods, Impact

Edited by Annette Arlander, Bruce Barton, Melanie Dreyer-Lude, and Ben Spatz

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First edition published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Arlander, Annette, 1956– editor. | Barton, Bruce, 1958– editor. | Dreyer-Lude, Melanie, editor. | Spatz, Ben, editor.
Title: Performance as research : knowledge, methods, impact / edited by Annette Arlander, Bruce Barton, Melanie Dreyer-Lude, and Ben Spatz.
Description: First edition. | New York : Routledge, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017020995 | ISBN 9781138068704 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138068711 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781315157672 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Performing arts—Research—Methodology.
Classification: LCC PN1576 .P43 2017 | DDC 790.2—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017020995

ISBN: 978-1-138-06870-4 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-138-06871-1 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-15767-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

Figures

Contributors

Annette Arlander is an artist, researcher, and a pedagogue based in Helsinki. She received a diploma in theatre directing (1981), MA (philosophy) and DA (theatre and drama, 1999). She was professor of performance art and theory at Theatre Academy, Helsinki (2001–2013), head of the Performing Arts Research Centre (2007–2009), professor of artistic research and vice dean for research at University of the Arts Helsinki Theatre Academy (2015–2016), visiting professor at Stockholm University of the Arts (2015–2016), and professor of artistic research at Academy of Fine Arts, University of the Arts Helsinki (2016). At present she is engaged in the project Performing with Plants at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. Arlander is a member of the editorial board of *JAR* (*Journal for Artistic Research*) and co-convener of the Artistic Research Working Group of Performance Studies International. She is the PI of the Academy of Finland-funded research project How to Do Things with Performance. Her research interests include artistic research, performance as research, performance studies, site-specificity, and the environment. Her artwork involves performing landscape by means of video or recorded voice, moving between performance art, video, and environmental art. For a full biography see https://annettearlander.com.

Bruce Barton is a creator/scholar whose practice-based research and teaching focus on physical dramaturgies in devised, immersive, and intermedial performance. He has published in a wide range of scholarly and practical periodicals, including *Performance Research*, *TDR*, *Theatre Journal*, *Theatre Topics*, *Canadian Theatre Review*, and *Theatre Research in Canada*, as well as numerous national and international essay collections. His book publications include *At the Intersection Between Art and Research* (2010), and *Collective Creation, Collaboration and Devising* (2008). Bruce is a co-convenor of the Performance as Research Working Group of the International Federation for Theatre Research, a co-convenor of the Artistic Research Working Group at Performance Studies international, and the artist relations officer on the PSi Board. Bruce is also an award-winning playmaker who works extensively as

a director, writer, and dramaturg with many of Canada's most accomplished physical performance companies. He is the artistic director of Vertical City, an interdisciplinary performance hub located in Calgary. In January 2015, Bruce became the first director of the new School of Creative and Performing Arts at the University of Calgary. For a full biography see http://brucewbarton.com/about-3/.

Yvon Bonenfant likes voices that do what voices don't usually do, and bodies that make technical virtuosities out of their 'flaws'. In 2012, his work took an interactive turn, investigating how we entice audiences to explore their own extra-normal voicings. His art, presentations, and publications have been supported by the AHRC, the British Academy, Arts Council England, EMPAC, and others; he has been Laureate of a Wellcome Trust Large Arts Award. His works have appeared in ten countries and he has published widely. Recently, he has begun experimenting with how we might render the aesthetic experience of queered vocal identity tactile; he co-developed Tract and Touch's voice-styling/hair-styling/touch-styling console *Curious Replicas* with vibration engineer Peter Glynne-Jones and coder Kingsley Ash. He is a professor of artistic process, voice and extended practices at the University of Winchester and artistic director of Tract and Touch.

Joanna Bucknall is a practitioner-scholar who has been making theatre, live art, performance art, durational works, and immersive performance since 2004. Her research interests include PBR methodologies, lively approaches to performance documentation, immersive/interactive dramaturgies, and embodied approaches to reception studies. She makes work that is audience-centric; immediate, intimate, and interactive. She currently works with two performance companies: KeepHouse Performance and Vertical Exchange Performance Collective. She is an associate artist at the New Theatre Royal (NTR) in Portsmouth. In the past she has worked with Fierce, The Barbican in Plymouth, Camden People's Theatre, The Basement in Brighton, Performing Arts Centre Lincoln, Brighton Fringe Festival, and Battersea Arts Centre. She is the creator of Talking About Immersive Theatre (TAIT). TAIT is a podcast series that hosts interviews with immersive and interactive theatre makers, producers, and performers working mostly in the UK.

Melanie Dreyer-Lude currently serves as Associate Professor and Coordinator of Theatre Studies in the Department of Theatre and Dance at Missouri State University. She is the former co-artistic director of ShatterMask Theatre (St. Louis) and International Culture Lab (New York City), and has been directing professionally for 25 years in many venues both domestic and abroad. She recently returned from Berlin, Germany, on a Fulbright Fellowship, where she investigated Germany's response to the current refugee crisis. Fluent in German, Dreyer-Lude translates and directs contemporary German plays that have been produced in the United States and Canada. She has been

a passionate advocate and participant in PAR practice since 2007. Currently, she is exploring collaborative projects with artists in Kampala, Uganda.

Carla Fernandes holds a PhD in cognitive linguistics. She was an Assistant Professor at IPLeiria until 2007, and is currently working as Principal Investigator and Invited Professor at FCSH – Universidade Nova de Lisboa. She was awarded a European Research Council grant for her interdisciplinary project BlackBox, a collaborative platform to document performance composition from conceptual structures in the backstage to customizable visualizations in the front-end, running under her direction at FCSH-UNL from 2014 to 2019. At present her research focus is in the intersection of arts and cognition, multimodal communication, new media, and the performing arts (from cognitive and ethnographic perspectives). Particular interests include the analysis of multimodal corpora and their relevance for the creation of digital "archives of processes," as alternative ways to document ephemeral art forms, such as contemporary dance. She is the author of book chapters and papers in international journals and conferences in the fields of multimodal communication, performance studies, digital media, and intangible heritage.

Manola K. Gayatri is a praxis-oriented writer, researcher, artist, and teacher. She is currently Postdoctoral Fellow in the Drama Department of University of Pretoria and Visiting Faculty at Ambedkar University, Delhi, at Centre for Development Practice. She received her doctorate in theatre and performance studies at the School of Arts and Aesthetics, Jawaharlal Nehru University, where she traced a feminist genealogy of women's poetic utterance. She was a postdoctoral project partner in the UGC-UKIERI project "Gendered Citizenship: Manifestations and Performance" (University of Warwick and JNU). She is co-founder of TILT, The Institute of Leadership and Transformation, based in Pretoria, and will be convener of the Performance-as-Research Working Group of the International Federation for Theatre Research from July 2017. As an artistic researcher she has presented work at national and international conferences in India, the UK, Italy, Germany, South Africa, Sweden, and other places.

Yelena Gluzman is a theatre and film director, scholar, and editor. Since 1999, she has made numerous "science projects" – performances that experimentally explore the conditions of encounter in theatre. Her recent work on academic methods of knowledge production includes a collaborative reading project called *Feminist Theory Theatre* (In *Imagined Theatres*, ed. Daniel Sack, 2017). Yelena is a founding editor at Ugly Duckling Presse, and edits both *Emergency INDEX* and the *Emergency Playscripts* series (*Emergency INDEX Vol. 6* and Annie Dorsen's *A Piece of Work* are forthcoming in 2017). She holds an MFA in theatre directing from Columbia University and is currently working towards a PhD in communication and science studies at UC San Diego. She is the recipient of a Making & Doing Award (with Sarah

Klein) from the Society for Social Studies of Science (2015), an Interdisciplinary Award from the UCSD Graduate Students Association (2016), and a Frontiers of Innovation Scholars Program (FISP) award.

Pil Hansen is an Assistant Professor of Dance and Drama at the University of Calgary, a founding member of Vertical City Performance, and a dance/devising dramaturg. Her empirical and PAR experiments examine cognitive dynamics of memory and perception in creative processes. She developed the tool-set "Perceptual Dramaturgy" and, with Bruce Barton, the interdisciplinary research model "Research-Based Practice." Hansen has dramaturged 26 works and her scholarly research is published in *TDR: The Drama Review*, *Performance Research*, *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, *Connection Science*, *Theatre Topics*, *Canadian Theatre Review*, *Peripiti, Koreografisk Journal*, *MAPA D2*, and 11 essay collections. Hansen is primary editor of *Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement* (2015) and *Performing the Remembered Present: The Cognition of Memory in Dance, Theatre and Music* (2017). Current and recent artistic collaborators are: Kaeja d'Dance, Theatre Junction Grand, Toronto Dance Theatre, and Public Recordings.

Jonathan Heron is IATL Deputy Director and a Principal Teaching Fellow at the University of Warwick, where he specialises in interdisciplinary practice. He was previously Research Associate at the CAPITAL Centre (a collaboration with the Royal Shakespeare Company) and Youth Arts Leader at Pegasus Oxford, during their fiftieth anniversary. He co-founded Fail Better Productions in 2001, the Student Ensemble in 2009, and the Samuel Beckett Laboratory (at Trinity College Dublin) in 2013. He co-convened the International Federation for Theatre Research 'Performance-as-Research' working group (2013–16) and co-established the 'Modernism, Medicine and Embodied Mind' AHRC-funded network (with Bristol University). His academic research has been published in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* (2014), *Shakespeare on the University Stage* (2015), *Medical Humanities* (British Medical Journals, 2016), and *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* (2017).

Stephan Jürgens holds a PhD in contemporary choreography and new media technologies. His research interests concentrate on designing creative strategies for live performance involving interactive systems. He has been teaching movement research, interdisciplinary choreography, and interactive system design. As a choreographer he has presented several works supported by the Portuguese Ministry of Culture. His collaborative digital performance work *.txt* won the national multimedia prize in 2010. He is the author of several peer-reviewed papers and book chapters. As a core researcher of the ERC-funded *BlackBox project*, Stephan is collaboratively exploring the intersection of the performing arts with the newest digital media technologies to support

software development assisting creative processes and performance composition. More concretely, his focus is on the "translation" of artistic conceptual structures in the work of selected artists into the software architecture of a novel collaborative platform to be built during the course of the project.

Baz Kershaw is Emeritus Professor of Theatre and Performance at University of Warwick. An engineer before gaining English, philosophy, and drama degrees from Manchester, Hawaii, and Exeter Universities, he has been visiting researcher at several universities abroad and keynote speaker at many international conferences. He directed PARIP (Practice as Research in Performance, 2000–06), the first major research initiative/enquiry for performing arts as research. Projects as a practitioner in experimental, community, and radical theatre include shows at the legendary London Drury Lane Arts Lab, with Ann Jellicoe's Colway Theatre Trust and Welfare State International, plus since 2000 several eco-specific events in southwest England. His many publications include *The Politics of Performance* (1992), *The Radical in Performance* (1999), *Cambridge History of British Theatre Vol. 3 Since 1895*, *Theatre Ecology* (2007), and (with Helen Nicholson) *Research Methods in Theatre and Performance* (2011). In 2010 he set up an Earthrise Repair Shop that aims to mend broken imaginings of Earth.

Shana MacDonald is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Drama and Speech Communication at the University of Waterloo. Her research examines the intersections between cinema, performance, screen-based installation, and public art with a focus on historical and contemporary feminist experimental media. This work is closely aligned with her practice as an internationally screened filmmaker, curator, and installation artist. She is founder and director of the 'Mobile Art Studio' (MAS), a transitory creative lab space that brings art out of the gallery and into public participatory spaces. Her artistic research is committed to finding new aesthetic forms for abandoned and undervalued materials, experiences, and histories. She has recent publications in *Performance Research*, *Media Fields*, *Feminist Media Histories*, and the *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*.

Juan Manuel Aldape Muñoz is concerned about choreographic processes, latinidad, undocumented bodies, and sweat citizenships. He is a co-organizer of the Festival of Latin American Contemporary Choreographers, as well as the e-resource convener for the International Federation for Theatre Research's Performance as Research working group. He is the co-founder of A PerFarmance Project, site-specific collaborations between farmers and performers researching the concept of food security and labour. For ten years, he was a member of the improvisational dance company Movement Forum. He is a PhD student in the performance studies program at UC Berkeley (US) and he holds an MA in international performance research from the University of Warwick (UK).

Laurelann Porter is currently an Assistant Professor of Communication Arts at Benedictine University. She received her PhD in theatre and performance of the Americas from Arizona State University. She earned her BFA in independent theatre studies from Boston University and her MFA in playwriting from Arizona State University. Her current research project is a collaboration with Brazilian dancer and choreographer Mestre Monza Calabar. Their work together seeks to explore the possibilities of teaching Afro-Brazilian histories and epistemologies through dance, movement, crafts, and culinary arts. Porter is also a playwright and solo performer. "Sympathy for Exú" is the newest product of her creative practice. The solo piece incorporates elements of Afro-Brazilian mythologies, in particular stories of the trickster figure, Exú. Her current playwriting project is a collaboration with a nursing scholar and fellow ethnographer, Dr Amy Funk. The project, "27 listeners" is based on Funk's dissertation research on sibling grief.

Monica Sand is a Swedish artist and artistic researcher with a PhD in architecture from the School of Architecture, the Royal Institute of Technology in 2008. During 2009–11 she was a postdoc at the University College of Arts Crafts and Design (Konstfack). Since 2011 Sand has been employed as a researcher and research-coordinator at the Swedish Centre for Architecture and Design in Stockholm. In both artistic practice and research as well as through courses in art and architecture, Sand stages spatial and collective experiments as a method to form and perform artistic research. With the long-term research project *Playing the Space* her aim is to compose and recompose urban rhythms and resonances through playful events in collaboration with sound-artists, dancers, musicians, students, researchers, and urban planners. https://playingthespace.wordpress.com.

Göze Saner is an actor, a practitioner-researcher, and a lecturer at the Department of Theatre and Performance, Goldsmiths, University of London. She studied philosophy at Bryn Mawr College and completed a practice-based PhD on archetype and performance at Royal Holloway, University of London. She has trained and performed internationally, with Bilsak Tiyatro Atölyesi led by Nihal Koldaş, with the Quick and the Dead led by Alison Hodge, with the New Winds led by Iben Nagel Rasmussen, and with her own company, cafila aeterna. *Göçmen Adımlar/Migrant Steps*, a community theatre project where she worked with groups of Turkish-speaking migrant women in the UK and Europe, won a Walk21 Walking Visionaries Jury Prize and continues with workshops in different public contexts. Investigating how the actor's work can be disseminated remotely to non-actors, Göze is currently developing a DIY *Migrant Steps* toolkit.

Valentina Signore is a freelance architect and Research Fellow in the Faculty of Architecture at KU Leuven. She gained a PhD in urban studies from the Università degli Studi di Roma Tre with the dissertation *The Performative*

Project: How to Recognise and Interpret It (2013). As a postdoc researcher she participated in the EU-funded project ADAPT-r, where she studied more than 20 creative practices and their practice researches. Valentina investigates research as a creative practice, focusing on the design of its artefacts as research outputs. She has contributed a chapter to the volume *Performative Urbanism Generating and Designing Urban Space* (Munich: Jovis, 2014) and is professionally trained in shiatsu.

Ben Spatz is Senior Lecturer in Drama, Theatre and Performance at the University of Huddersfield; author of *What a Body Can Do: Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research* (2015); convener of the Embodied Research Working Group within the International Federation for Theatre Research; editor of the *Journal of Embodied Research*, a peer-reviewed videographic journal launched in 2017; and Arts & Humanities Research Council Leadership Fellow (2016–2018) with the project 'Judaica: An Embodied Laboratory for Song-Action'. Recent talks and workshops include 'What Is a Song?' (The British Library), 'Beyond Performer Training' (University of Kent), 'An Epistemic Context for Martial Arts' (University of Cardiff), 'Decolonizing Song-Action: A Laboratory Report' (Maynooth University), 'Re-Reading Grotowski in the Anthropocene' (University of the Arts Helsinki), and 'Future Documents: Video Epistemology and Embodied Research' (University of Manchester).

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to acknowledge the core influence of the Performance as Research Working Group of the International Federation for Theatre Research (FIRT/IFTR) in the endeavour of creating this book. Many, but not all, contributions in this volume are made by members or visitors of the working group. After initial meetings at conferences in Amsterdam (2002) and St. Petersburg (2005), organised by the first convenors Baz Kershaw and Jacqueline Martin, the group had its first official meeting at the IFTR conference in Helsinki (2006) and has since met at every yearly conference. We want to thank the subsequent convenors of the working group, not contributing to this volume, Anna Birch, Mark Fleishman, Emma Meehan and Johnmichael Rossi, for developing the practices and discourses around performance as research and for supporting publication endeavours. We want to extend our gratitude to all presenters and participants over the years, some of whom joined the group for one conference, while others have participated in most of the meetings, here listed in alphabetical order (with apologies for any unintended omissions):

Cynthia Asperger, Jane Bacon, Paul Barker, Stefanie Bauerochse, Annouchka Bayley, Matteo Bonfitto, June Boyce-Tillman, Mari Boyd, Marie-Louise Crawley, Alison Curtis-Jones, Flavia D'Avila, Chloé Déchery, Maria Ni Dubhain, Natalia Duong, Natalia Esling, Rakel Ezpeleta, Robert Faguy, Angie Farrow, Anna Fenemore, Ciane Fernandes, Kristin Fredricksson, David Furnham, Bree Hadley, Kristina Hagström-Ståhl, Daniela Hahn, Dorita Hannah, Luciana Hartmann, I Lien Ho, Ali Hodge, Carolien Hermans, Pauliina Hulkko, Tomi Humalisto, Lynette Hunter, Mark Hunter, Kathleen Irwin, Ola Johansson, Esa Kirkkopelto, Anu Koskinen, May Agnes Krell, Annelis Kuhlmann, Soile Lahdenperä, Karen Lauke, Jean Lee, Peilin Liang, Alys Longley, Holly Maples, David Mason, Marina Marcondes Machado, Junghwa Mah, Jiao Yin Mei, Nando Messias, Roberta Mock, Tero Nauha, Tessa Needham, Ursula Neuerburger Denzer, Helen Newall, Ludimila Mota Nunes, Richard O'Brien, Dan Olsen, Elaine O'Sullivan, Kjell Yngve Petersen, Diego Pizarro, Pilvi Porkola, Stephen Purcell, Lucia Repasska, Walmeri Ribeiro, Alison Richards, Helen Richardsson, Elisabeth de Roza, Judith Rudakoff, Stefanie Sachsenmaier, Paula Salosaari, Cibele Sastre, Christina Schmutz, Marianne Sharp, Lena Simic, Jaqui Singer,

Karin Sondergaard, Zoe Svendsen, Mark Swetz, Mary Tarantino, Mark Tatlow, Myer Taub, Mariana Terra, Liz Tomlin, James Wilson, Harry Wilson, Viktoria Volkova, Martin Wylde, and Abd Latif Zaina.

The editors also wish to thank the contributors for their patience during the publication process; editorial assistant Natalia Esling and University of Calgary graduate research assistants, Sarah Bannister and Adrian Young, for their invaluable help in preparing the manuscript for submission; and our editors at Routledge, Kate Edwards and Ben Piggott, for their professionalism and skill in producing this volume.


Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Introduction 1

Wherefore PAR?

Discussions on "a line of flight"

Bruce Barton

Perhaps it will come across as contrarian to begin the introduction to a volume of essays with the primary title *Performance as Research* with a refusal to attempt to define performance as research (PAR). However, PAR, in all its many permutations, has often been the domain of good-natured and well-intentioned contrarians, and in this regard the present volume continues a firmly established tradition. Certainly, in a number of ways this publication adopts structures and strategies that will be familiar for readers acquainted with previous essay collections on this and related topics. The voices gathered here are similarly (if not more so) diverse in terms of geography, culture, and artistic discipline, as well as in their relationship to embodied practice and institutional affiliation. However, this collection also attempts, both directly and through nuance, some distinct departures from earlier collections that we hope will be productively facilitative, rather than (merely) provocative. These include most explicitly the points of individual focus named in its subtitle, but also an attempt to both recognize and establish sites of connection, juxtaposition, and intersection between conspicuously diverse approaches to an undeniably diversified field of research.

It will be useful here to trace the trajectory of this volume back to its inception. Its birthplace was the Performance as Research Working Group of the International Federation for Theatre Research (IFTR), which has met annually since its first gathering in 2006, then under the stewardship of Baz Kershaw and Jacqueline Martin. In 2013 the Working Group (then convened by Annette Arlander along with Jonathan Heron and Emma Meehan) established a publications subcommittee made up of the other three editors of this volume (Barton, Dreyer-Lude, and Spatz). Thus, as editors we were gathered within the pre-established context of the Working Group's self-designation as a PAR organization, including that group's congregate, historically evolving understandings of what PAR is and can be. Seeking to both honor and exploit that context but also to push the discourse beyond prior publications on the topic, we drafted an uncommonly detailed, even prescriptive open call for proposals. The resulting collection thus includes entries by some of the Working Group's longstanding members as well as many new voices from around the globe. Further, in this CFP we aimed to both acknowledge existing perspectives and chart an

extended trajectory through the distinct yet interrelated categories of *knowledge*, *methods*, and *impact*. As stated in the open call,

> In order to make meaningful contributions to an academic environment that increasingly prioritizes interdisciplinary social and political inquiry, does PAR need to demonstrate not only rigorous application of methodologies and documentation strategies, but also substantive results? What form might these results take? Beyond performative "symbolic data" – which only increases in artistic value through ambiguity and openness to interpretation – must PAR generate more conventionally accessible and less ambiguous results? Must these results satisfy the criteria more commonly associated with other forms of research activity, such as *outcomes*, *impact*, *utility*, *circulation*, *transmissibility*, and *transferability*? To what degree, and in what ways, should the established criteria of *knowledge production* determine and shape the potential of PAR activity, currently and in the coming decades? How might PAR practitioners advocate for expanded and refined engagement with a diverse range of fields of knowledge – somatic, kinesthetic, and phenomenological, in addition to more traditional analytical and empirical models – as a means of extending the potential of PAR validity and relevance?

These questions reflect a set of priorities shared by all of the volume's editors. Our common goal was to court both an expansive disciplinary range and a distinct degree of specificity in terms of critical articulation: "We welcome proposals addressing PAR processes and projects drawn from a broad, thoroughly interdisciplinary spectrum, and from both academic and non-institutional contexts. All proposals should be grounded in specific creative, artistic, and/or embodied practices. Further, all proposals should reflect the authors' careful and explicit reflection on the key considerations detailed above: (1) *contextual disciplines or fields of knowledge*; (2) *methods and/or methodologies*; and (3) *results of the research*."

Despite this solidarity, however, and despite the real pleasure we take in working with one another, I think it is safe to say that the four of us have quite different relationships with PAR, both in terms of our own practices and in terms of the now extensive existing scholarship in this area. No doubt, then, both the preconceptions with which we entered this publication project and the explicit individual contributions we have made to its pages reflect this heterogeneity – as does the somewhat unorthodox decision to punctuate the volume with no fewer than four separate 'introductions,' each of which asserts a distinct and characteristic orientation on our shared topic. Even within the confines of a small sub-committee of a focused Working Group within a single scholarly association, PAR remains a conspicuously elusive idea – at precisely the same time that it is passionately advocated.

These same two characteristics of PAR as it relates to artistic practice – its elusive nature and its passionate pursuit – are in ample evidence throughout

the essays contained in this volume. Arguably, a call for proposals organized under the rubric of practice as research, practice-based research, practice-led research, or any number of other affiliated designations would have attracted a similarly diverse set of submissions – possibly from many of the same authors. Despite the many concerted and worthy efforts by practitioners and scholars to stake claims, delimit territories, and define jurisdictions, the research conducted under the banner of performance as research is almost inevitably *congregate*, even aquisitory (as in "seeking to acquire and own, often greedily" [Dictionary.com]) in terms of its engagement with both methods and methodology. Thus, while attempts to distinguish between multiple categories of related activity (PAR, PaR, PBR, etc.) are often successful in differentiating *theoretically* between preliminary motivations, methodological priorities, institutional contexts, and geographic locations, the same designations are only occasionally respected neatly or simply by the research activity itself. This situation in no way diminishes the importance of these efforts towards definitions, which are critical acts that serve (at least) the twinned necessities of personal self-reflection and institutional self-validation. But these same circumstances assert additional obligations, within such a highly diversified and mutable field of activity, towards more locally oriented and specifically focused articulation.

This introductory essay – as noted, the first of four – is one attempt among several within this volume to imagine and perform strategies to fulfill this obligation of focused articulation. As also noted, our establishment of three key areas of emphasis was among our earliest and most explicit gestures in this regard. Co-editor Melanie Dreyer-Lude's astute and attentive cross-referencing of key tropes, preoccupations, and structural elements (Introduction II) across all the entries in the collection is another. Ben Spatz's intentionally (if benevolently) provocative querying of the very possibility of PAR (Introduction III), with its insistence on a much needed if uncommon precision of terminology, is another. And Annette Arlander's thoroughly informed and contextualized speculation on future developments (Introduction IV), which seeks to position PAR within a broader assessment of the "performative turn," is yet another. For my part, I propose that the path to higher levels of precision in articulation requires an initial, perhaps counter-intuitive concession to *generalization* as a process of *distillation*, and the use of a broader brush as a means towards a common basis from which key entry points and appropriate frames of reference for more narrowly defined specificity may be determined.

To this end, my strategy in this essay is to expand my focus by one full layer in the discourse, to leave the discussion of PAR's specificity to other voices in this collection and to open up the conversation more widely in an effort to enclose PAR within an embrace that also includes the many orientations towards knowledge discovery/creation with which it is often affiliated. This is certainly not to assert that there aren't significant distinctions at the level of methodological specificity between, for instance, performance as research and practice as research (an issue Spatz's contribution directly addresses), or between

either of these approaches and practice-led research or research-led practice. Rather, my proposal is that, for the purposes of this introduction, they may be effectively carried forward as a congregate (rather than a collapsed or conflated) *field* of research activity.

The first challenge offered by this approach is determining how to refer to this meta-grouping of research orientations in a manner that is sufficiently both circumscribed *and* elastic. We could return to one of the earliest and most influential research projects in this field and use the designation practice as research in performance (see my discussion of the UK-based PARIP project, ahead). This gesture addresses, at least in part, the commonly perceived tension between 'performance' and 'practice' as the primary correlate to 'research,' and would certainly be adequate to describe the majority of the activity addressed within this volume. However, the much-discussed implications of placing "as" between performance or practice and research continue to evoke a binary relationship between these primary terms – one that is at times accurate and productive but as often imprecise and distracting. Therefore, for the purpose of this introduction I propose the blanket designation "artistic research in performance" (ARP). "Artistic research" as a pre-existing categorization is, of course, not free from associated preconceptions or regional specificity, but combined with an explicit reference to performance it would seem to offer the most effective combination of flexibility, inclusivity, and precision for what I am attempting in this writing.

The first step in this attempt towards articulation is to frame an understanding of artistic research (AR), generally. As Arlander suggests in her concluding introduction in this volume, AR is perhaps most effectively understood as a field comprising multiple more or less methodologically singular and/or stable subfields, an intentionally inclusive category that enfolds a diverse set of research activities that employ artistic or creative practice as an integrated aspect of the inquiry process. There is substantial and significant scholarship in this field; there is also increasing scholarly and professional activity on an international level that asserts AR's priorities and endeavors to advance its practices. However, the field remains a highly disparate one, both challenged and energized by a multiplicity of definitions, interpretations, and applications. This diversity is one of the field's explicit strengths, requiring a collective openness to alternative perspectives, development, and growth. The same diversity, however, is also the primary cause of the relatively ambiguous profile and at times tenuous status of AR within many institutional *and* professional artistic contexts.

Effectively, then, AR can be employed as an "umbrella concept" that captures "a landscape of various approaches to knowledge production in performing arts" (Arlander 2009, 77). Following this line of argument, AR can be understood as consisting of a diversity of more narrowly focused and defined methodological approaches, including but not limited to the following.

Performance as research (here referred to as PAR)
Practice as research (PaR)

Practice-based research (PBR)
Practice-led research (PLR)
Arts-based research (ABR)
Research-led practice (RLP)
Research-based practice (RBP)
Research practice (RP)
Research through practice (RtP)
Research creation (RC)
Creative research (CR)
Studio research (SR)

Some of these subcategories (a less than exhaustive list) reflect precise and strategic differentiations – between, for instance, *practice-led research*, the results of which can be fully communicated through written documentation, and *practice-based research*, the results of which cannot be fully comprehended without direct access to the creative products and processes of its incorporated practices (Candy 2006, 3). However, the distinctions between many of these approaches – between, for instance, research practice, research through practice, research creation, and creative research – are often elusive, nuanced, and context-specific, making confident and reliable communication and exchange difficult across (and, indeed, within) geographic, cultural, institutional, and disciplinary borders. Indeed, as noted earlier, 'PaR' is often used for both performance as research and practice as research – a practice evident within some of the entries in this volume. For clarity, I have here adopted the distinctions offered by Lynette Hunter – PAR for performance as research and PaR for practice as research – but for other writers the gesture of merging the two orientations within a single acronym ranges from unwitting to incidental to intentional. In contrast, my gesture here of resorting to "artistic research" is in no way meant to avoid or discount these important sites of precision (and equally significant sites of imprecision or conflation), but rather to identify a set of common attributes on a meta level across virtually all of these epistemological orientations.

One important criterion, however, is established by returning, full-circle, to the combination of AR with *performance* in our working concept of "artistic research in performance" (ARP). For instance: despite adopting a pronounced level of inclusivity, for the purposes of this introduction ARP here does not include arts-informed research – "a mode and form of qualitative research that is influenced by, but not based in, the arts" (MacCallum 2016). Similarly, while several of the sub-categories identified earlier have firmly established histories and profiles within a wide range of non-artistic disciplinary contexts – including social work, nursing/medicine, and design – my reflections in this essay focus predominantly on the application of AR to the performing arts (within the admittedly broad parameters of interdisciplinarity discussed ahead). Perhaps more controversially, I am also excluding personal artistic inquiry – a sub-category particularly susceptible to multiple interpretations but here understood

as localized individual development conducted without the intention to communicate or share results beyond those individuals immediately participating. This extended gesture of transmission, effecting a transfer of utility, is here considered a baseline characteristic of ARP.

At the risk of overstatement: I offer ARP here as a congregate concept, one that focuses on global commonalities among its constituent practices while respecting the distinctiveness of each. None of the authors cited here use "artistic research in performance" in their discussions; as such, in each of the contexts to which I refer to ARP where a cited author originally focuses on one of these constituents – for example, PAR, PaR, and PBR – I specify that original research orientation in parentheses: for example, 'ARP (sp. performance as research)' or 'ARP (sp. practice-based research).' My intention here is not the erasure of differences but rather the identification of key shared characteristics.

I offer this gesture of generalization-amidst-difference as a cautious but direct reflection of the experience I have benefited from in multiple contexts where the elusive relationship between practice, performance, and research was/is being teased out and sorted. In addition to participating in the IFTR PAR Working Group, I had the privilege of working as a founding member of the Practice-Based Research Study Circle at the Nordic Summer University in Northern Europe, where I provided a modest editorial contribution to *At the Intersection Between Art and Research: Practice-Based Research in the Performing Arts* (Friberg, Parekh-Gaihede, and Barton 2010), the essay collection that emerged from the first three-year cycle of that group's collaboration. The section titles in Sidsel Pape's introduction to that volume make explicit the negotiations of terminology that characterized the Study Circle's deliberations: "Expanding the Field," "Our Linguistic Journey," and "Multiple Viewpoints" (2010, 9–12). I attended as a core member for nearly ten years the now-defunct Performance as Research Working Group at the American Society for Theatre Research (ASTR), an uncommonly and unfailingly heterogeneous gathering of kindred spirits from diverse locations, backgrounds, paradigms, and institutional contexts. I have participated in the Artistic Research Working Group of Performance Studies international (PSi), having recently become the group's co-convenor as well as the Artist Relations Officer on the PSi board, with responsibility for the AR component of that organization's annual conference programming. In Canada I am the founding convenor of the "Articulating Artistic Research" Seminar at the annual conference of the Canadian Association for Theatre Research (CATR), which marked its fifth gathering in 2017, and for a decade I was responsible for the core master's- and PhD-level courses in praxis (practice-based research) at the University of Toronto's Centre for Drama, Theatre and Performance Studies. These many sites of encounter have continually shaped my understanding(s) of the overlaps and divergences, intersections and inter-weavings, complementarities and antipathies that animate the global ARP conversation.

As also noted earlier, the available literature on PAR, PaR, and related research orientations here enfolded into ARP has burgeoned over the past two decades,

a reflection of the increasing occurrence and diversity of approaches and priorities. Within this scholarship, articulating precisely what ARP, broadly defined, constitutes remains a topic of animated discussion. Is it a "methodology" (Hannula et al. 2014), a "discipline" or "species" (Barrett and Bolt 2007, 1), a "paradigm" (Jones 2009, 19; Bolt 2016) or "pre-paradigm" (or "non-paradigm") (Kjørup 2012, 36), an "anti-discipline" (Kershaw and Nicholson 2011, 3), or a colonization of traditional research practice by artistic priorities (Klein 2010)? Yet what unites virtually all variants of ARP is an explicit – if at times reluctant – investment in baseline criteria for defining research within institutionalized academic contexts. Foremost among these criteria are *documentation*, *dissemination*, and *utility* through *transferability*. While these criteria represent challenges within virtually all artistic disciplines, the performing arts, with their reliance on embodied practice, interpretive subjectivity, and immediate experience, are particularly vulnerable in this regard. Peggy Phelan's now-legendary assertion, almost a quarter century ago, that performance "becomes itself through disappearance" (Phelan 1993, 146) provided both an enduring conceptual pivot for artistic practice and a dogged impediment in the process of securing ARP's place in the academy. Phelan's highly influential prioritizing of the *ephemerality* of performance ensured that the status of ARP would be both fraught and complicated within conventional processes of institutional recognition, analysis, evaluation, and accreditation.

Not surprisingly, then, this anxiety about institutional validation has been a formative preoccupation within efforts to establish and articulate ARP as a legitimate field of activity. This process of self-justification – what Hawkins and Wilson (2016) term "special pleadings" – is at times interpreted as a galvanizing source of solidarity amid diversity; at others, however, it is experienced as an unresolvable if inevitable distraction, one which holds the potential to constrain and even distort ARP's potential for discovery. Shannon Jackson's carefully considered response to the question "when is art research?" is, in part, "to suggest that we need not be 'governed quite so much' or at least, 'not quite like that'" (2009, 163); however, such permissions are as rare as they are hard won. Within the performing arts, this tension is clearly evident in one of the earliest, most significant, and commonly recognized ARP-oriented initiatives, already referenced earlier: Practice as Research in Performance (PARIP), a five-year research project hosted by the University of Bristol from 2001 to 2006. Explicitly named in PARIP's key Aims and Objectives was the need to "develop knowledges about appropriate criteria for evaluation," as well as consultation "on a series of creative projects [. . .] to advance potential uses of new digital technologies for the documentation and dissemination of best practices" ("Overview"). While the emerging capacities of new media resulted in an impressive gallery of research "Artefacts," a dominant strain throughout much of the extant PARIP documentation relates to the "inherent paradox" (Rye 2003) offered by digital recording's deceiving efficiency. "How, then," queried PARIP participant Angela Piccini,

> is this type of research best identified, evidenced and disseminated, if we accept that the academy will continue to demand such activity? And when these research knowledges are translated into other media what are the best ways to indicate, in the translation, what knowledges are lost or gained?
>
> (Piccini 2002)

Arguably, this ambivalence about the potential distortion of documentation in relation to the performing arts represents a central, complicating trope in any effort to articulate modes of ARP, one that endures in many contexts through to the present moment (e.g., considerable time at the 2015 gathering of the IFTR PAR Working Group was dedicated to the question "Why document?"). This is the case despite significant advances in complex understandings of liveness, particularly within intermedial performance contexts (see, e.g., Auslander 1999/2008; Barton 2008, 2009; Barton, Dreyer-Lude and Birch 2013; Birringer 2008, 2015; Dixon 2007, 2016; Scott 2016). However, much of the literature produced on approaches to ARP in the years following the PARIP initiative – such as the persuasive example offered by Stephan Jürgens and Carla Fernandes in this volume – engages with this perceived dilemma of articulation, reflecting significant advances in its framing, comprehension, and resolution.

Significant among early twentieth-century efforts to broker the apparently paradoxical demands discussed earlier was that offered by Henk Borgdorff, who positioned ARP (sp. artistic research) squarely between the priorities of academia on the one hand and those found within art professions on the other. At that intersection, he proposes, AR can address "questions that are pertinent in the research context and in the art world" (2006, 10). Thus, for Borgdorff, while AR attempts to "articulate the tacit knowledge that is situated and embodied in specific artworks and artistic processes," it nonetheless employs "experimental and hermeneutic methods" and its "processes and outcomes are documented and disseminated in an appropriate manner to the research community and the wider public" (2006, 18). In stark contrast, in the same publication year Brad Haseman asserted the need for ARP (sp. performance as research) to push past conventional interpretations of practice-led research to what he proposed as "performative research." Drawing on J.L. Austin's proposal of *performative utterances* (1962), Haseman advocates for research models that eschew problems or questions as starting points, substituting "an enthusiasm of practice" (Haseman 2006, 3) as both catalyst and motivation. Further, and most significantly, Haseman promotes research practices that insist "that their research outputs and claims to knowing must be made through the symbolic language and forms of their practice" (ibid., 4). (I will return to the 'performative turn' as a conceptual framework later in this introduction; the same topic is picked up again in detail in Arlander's concluding introduction.)

It could be argued that most attempts to explain ARP locate themselves, regardless of whether intentionally, along a continuum between Borgdorff's and Haseman's proposals, as both provide, explicitly and implicitly, three key points of entry into the discussion from which to frame a position: *knowledge*: ARP's

distinct and potentially expansive epistemological horizons; *methods*: ARP's application of and status within the network of existing methodological orientations to research; and *impact*: ARP's conflicted and contentious relationship with outcomes, products, results, applications, and utility. Many of the essays in this collection also explicitly address these same porous categories, and certainly all engage with them, often no less thoroughly, on an implicit level. It is not my intention, therefore, to attempt some sort of exhaustive survey or authoritative assessment of the status of these elements within the many variants of ARP or its discourse, but rather to delineate what I see as some of the most pertinent of attributes across a wide spectrum of artistic research orientations.

Knowledge

Virtually all articulations of PAR and related approaches to ARP, not surprisingly, seek their co-ordinates through a relationship to the production of *knowledge*. Regularly referenced as a starting point in this process is the *OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms* (2008, qtd. in Klein 2010, 1), which defines research as "any creative systematic activity undertaken in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this knowledge to devise new applications." Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt preface their exploration of the specifics of ARP (sp. artistic research) with the generalized proposal that "artistic practice be viewed as the production of knowledge or philosophy in action" with "the potential to extend the frontiers of research" (Barrett and Bolt 2007, 13). Extending this assertion through the lenses of Bergson and Deleuze, Mark Fleishman, in a discussion of PAR, asserts the "difference of performance as a mode of research" as "its refusal of binaries (body – mind, theory – practice, space – time, subject – object), its radical openness, its multiplicities, its unrepresentability, its destabilization of all pretentions to fixity and determination" (Fleishman 2012, 32). Here Fleishman would seem to share Borgdorff's assertion that the "primary importance [of ARP-aligned research] lies not in explicating the implicit or non-implicit knowledge enclosed in art. It is more directed at not-knowing, or not-yet-knowing. It creates room for that which is unthought, that which is unexpected" (Borgdorff 2010; see also Borgdorff's extended 2012 discussion on this topic).

Clearly, however, this championing of "unrepresentability" and "not-knowing" stands both as one of ARP's defining characteristics and as one of its primary obstacles in its ongoing quest for shared conceptual frameworks to facilitate exchange and collaboration. A central aspect of this paradox is the commonly held priority that, to a defining degree, both the processes and the knowledge generated within/through ARP are *fully embodied*. Julien Klein asserts that the knowledge accessed via ARP (sp. artistic research)

> has to be acquired through sensory and emotional perception, precisely through artistic experience, from which it can not [sic] be separated.

> Whether silent or verbal, declarative or procedural, implicit or explicit – in any case, artistic knowledge is sensual and physical, 'embodied knowledge'. The knowledge that artistic research strives for, [sic] is a *felt* knowledge.
> (Klein 2010, 6)

This echoes Haseman's dismissal of the obligation to translate findings into verbal or numerical registers, and his assertion that a 'performative research' understanding of ARP (sp. performance as research) "challenges traditional ways of representing knowledge claims." For Haseman, this leads to the insistence that "people who wish to evaluate the research outcomes also need to experience them in direct (co-presence) or indirect (asynchronous, recorded) form" (Haseman 2006, 3).

As Pil Hansen succinctly puts it in her contribution to this collection, "discussions of politics of knowledge are central to the evolving PAR-discourse."

> Proposals are made for how the knowledge production of PAR approaches can be recognized independently of established knowledge criteria, in part by advancing what I read as an epistemology of enaction or interaction and a (n)ontology of emergence. With these terms I refer to the notion that phenomena are believed neither to exist ontologically in and of themselves nor to be accessible through objective methods of observation; they emerge relationally, through active and embodied engagement, which also is how they are accessed. In other words, the ontology is epistemological. Artist-researchers are, understandably, raising guards against more established knowledge paradigms in order to evolve research practices on these terms.

Yet however seductive the defensive maneuver, this need not necessarily be the hill on which ARP conquers or perishes. To attain acknowledgment and acceptance within contemporary 'knowledge economies,' some scholars and scholar-practitioners (including Hansen) have found themselves pursuing diversified registers within which significant aspects of ARP-aligned activity, and its value, can be widely recognized and readily utilized.

Conceding the powerfully affective and primarily embodied nature of much ARP-related activity, yet resisting the gravitational pull to sustained binaries cautioned by Fleishman,[1] Robin Nelson has advanced a hybrid model for PaR first introduced in 2006 and further developed in later essays and his influential 2013 volume *Practice as Research in the Arts*. As contrasted with the familiar "know-that" orientation of traditional research practices, Nelson's "modes of knowing" framework foregrounds the multiple knowledges accessed through PaR. He thus distinguishes between "know-how" ('insider' close-up knowing that is experiential, haptic, tacit, and embodied) and "know-what" (which is further divided into the "tacit made explicit through critical reflection" on the part of the artist and "'outsider' distant knowledge" available through observation and analysis) (Nelson 2006, 2009, 2013). Nelson asserts that, at least

at present (and perhaps unavoidably), it is only through the combination of this full range of modes of knowing – including the "know-that" practices of "documentation and complementary writings" (Nelson 2013, 70) – that the full potential of PaR may be realized.

> Accordingly, my model for PaR, while fully recognizing the importance of close-up, tacit, haptic know-how, seeks a means to establish as fully as possible the articulation of 'liquid knowing,' and a shift through intersubjectivity into the know-what of shared and corroborated soft knowledge, in turn resonating with the harder know-that of established conceptual frameworks. (Ibid. 60)

Nelson's model shares multiple key priorities with "research-based practice" (RBP), a model that Hansen and I first introduced in 2008 and have continued to develop through successive ARP contexts. As Hansen's entry in this volume demonstrates, however, there are several defining differences, as well – distinctions that serve as a bridge to the second of this volume's subtitled areas of emphasis. A conspicuously mixed-method approach to ARP, RBP extends the recognition of multiple conceptual spaces utilized by Nelson to a process of literal 'space making.' Through efforts to clarify and prioritize methodological distinctions within a multistage framework, RBP attempts to defuse the epistemological and ideological tensions that can hobble ARP initiatives, particularly in interdisciplinary contexts.

Methods

Epistemology and methodology are, of course, inseparably interwoven, and it would be difficult here to effectively catalogue or chronicle the methodological diversity demonstrated within the full spectrum of ARP activities. Extending the possibilities (and exacerbating the challenges) associated with methodological diversity is the observation that ARP approaches, in both their processes and their resultant knowledge, are inherently *interdisciplinary* and *transdisciplinary*, qualities that Barrett and Bolt, discussing PAR, directly associate with its embodied, affective, and interactive nature. Specifically, they assert that PAR's "*relationality*" and its "capacity to reinvent social relations" dismantle disciplinary distinctions and create "conditions for the emergence of new analogies, metaphors and models for understanding objects of inquiry" (Barrett and Bolt 2007, 7). In a related gesture, Kershaw and Nicholson (following Dwight Conquergood) identify "creative inquiry through practical theatre and performance making" as an "anti-discipline [. . .] with a determination to explore productive instabilities between existing epistemological practices and ontological results" (Kershaw and Nicholson 2011, 2–3).

Perhaps the single most common methodological preoccupation among ARP-related researchers is the *emergent* nature of both its processes and its

products. Foregrounding the intersection between subjectivity and interaction in which the researcher "is both the practitioner who makes things happen and the audience or respondent" (Hunter 2009, 151), Lynette Hunter anchors the emergent nature of ARP (sp. performance as research) within its production of *situated* knowledge: "In the arts, situated knowledge becomes a situated textuality, knowledge always in the making, focusing on the process but situated wherever it engages an audience" (ibid., 152). Generated within situated sites of interaction, then, ARP (sp. practice as research) emerges, for Barrett and Bolt, both spatially and, of particular significance, *temporally* "through material processes. Because such processes are (at least in part) predicated on the tacit and alternative logic of practice *in time*, their precise operations cannot be predetermined" (Barrett and Bolt 2007, 6). In this light, readers familiar with Baz Kershaw's extensive writing on the conditions of ARP-related approaches (both PAR and PaR) will find his contribution to this volume reaffirming when he describes one of his most recent and instructively titled projects, "Meadow Meanderings": "[T]he *meandering* of the path is at least as important as its ecological analogue, because its apparent aimlessness constitutes a lacuna or gap in experience for the meanderer that is potentially profound." Indeed, as Dieter Lesage has observed, "What all these different practices have in common is the need of time, time to think, time to see, time to waste." However, Lesage concedes, "As time is money, time is never given to anyone for free, and certainly not to the artist" (Lesage 2013, 150).

One strategy to purchase time for methodologies of emergence is, as with Nelson's model, to couple them with more familiar research activities and outputs – although, to a degree, this can also impose more regulated patterns of documentation and dissemination. Another, as with research-based practice (RBP), is to link emergence sequentially and causally with more traditional product and process orientations to both research *and* artistic practice, thereby earning allowance – spatial, temporal, and conceptual – for a "3rd Space" (Hansen and Barton 2009, 122) of autonomy through a guarantee of eventual relevance and utility. Still others, such as that proposed by Joanna Bucknall in her contribution to this collection, seek to explicitly "marshal, map, analyse and document the discourse that is produced in and by PBR, as well as the role of relational fields of discourse in the development of praxis." Bucknall's methodical reflection on the "relational heritage" of any one project through the excavation of the longer-term influences at play in its creation proposes the recognition of a significantly wider temporal horizon of gestation and realization, one that arguably respects few limitations.

Fleishman's treatise on "the difference" of ARP (sp. performance as research) offers yet another strategy that effectively emphasizes the field's interweaving of knowledge and methods, and in the process articulates an eloquent interpretation of its distinct relation to time. Beginning with the proposal that PAR "is a series of embodied repetitions [. . .] in time [. . .] in search of difference" (Fleishman 2012, 30), drawing upon Deleuze and Guattari, Fleishman then describes

a series of case study performances produced over multiple years as essentially iterations (repetitions with difference) in a "process of creative evolution"[2]:

> [I]f there is difference arising from the successive iterations of each project, it is not occurring serially in the individual representations as a set of connectable points. Rather it is occurring in the 'middle' as a process of inventive becoming, and "becoming has neither beginning nor end, departure nor arrival, origin nor destination . . . [it] is neither one nor two nor the relation of the two; it is the in-between, the border or line of flight"[3] that runs perpendicular to both.
>
> (Ibid., 34)

This understanding of PAR's perpetual emergence is directly linked to Fleishman's assertion of its "unrepresentabilty," and he contends that we "need to find ways to 'feel and live the intervals'[4]" if we are to truly engage PAR's constitutive difference. Yet in the absence of such . . . grace, perhaps? . . . Fleishman concedes, however reluctantly, that the articulation of PAR is possible only through a resort to "a kind of perceptual still point, a slowing down or thickening of the ongoing, of the flow" (ibid., 35). This is, of course, the crux, the familiar image (bringing to mind the cliché of butterflies and straight pins), and the central methodological challenge – one that serves nicely as a segue into this volume's final subtitle area of emphasis.

Impact

It is the burden of impact that is most frequently understood not as an impetus to explore perceptual still points but rather as an imposed obligation that threatens to bring the flow of ARP activities to a grinding, economically motivated standstill. Impact is often perceived as the gateway to quantitative measurement and the instrumentalization of artistic processes, framed within statistical discourse and driven by monetary imperatives.

These are 'knee-jerk' responses, perhaps, but there are certainly grounds for such strongly negative expectations. This is particularly so within the PAR/PaR-dense UK context, which has only recently weathered the direct consequences of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) that officially established expectations of impact in its comprehensive assessment of the quality of research generated by 154 UK universities (in addition to "outputs" and "environment"). In this instance, impact was evaluated by means of submitted case studies demonstrating "any social, economic or cultural impact or benefit beyond academia that has taken place during the assessment period [. . .] underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitting institution within a given timeframe" ("REF2014"). Impact was further defined by means of the criteria of "'reach' (how widely the impact was felt) and 'significance' (how transformative it was)" ("Workshops" 2010, 3).

In theory, the inclusion of a category of research benefit that extends beyond a project's academic footprint is a worthy and welcome gesture. However, as Tom Cahill and Mark Bazzaco assert, multiple factors challenge the straightforward assessment of academic research impact, including complications associated with *timing* (impacts are often delayed and/or long-term), *attribution* (determining responsibility within multiple, often isolated roles and initiatives), *appropriability* (determining who benefits within diverse networks of impacts), and *inequality* (measurement across different types of research and impacts) (Cahill and Bazzaco 2015). With particular reference to this last factor, it is not difficult to see how much more complicated it is to assess social and cultural, as compared to economic, impact, a reality that almost inevitably makes systematic a privileging of certain types of research results – those accessible through concrete and empirical measurement strategies – over those that broker in more elusive modes of impact.

The clearly well-intentioned observations offered following a series of REF "Workshops on the impacts of research in the practice-based creative and performing arts, the humanities and social sciences" demonstrate how potentially ill-suited standard gauges of impact can be when applied to ARP activities:

> In relation to reach, it was felt that information such as audience sizes and viewing figures did not always provide sufficient information on the reach of the impact. It was also noted that reach should not be simply equated with geography. It was felt that international dissemination did not necessarily reflect an international impact.
>
> ("Workshops" 2010, 3)

The anticipation that audience statistics or touring schedules could possibly provide assessments of "reach" directly reflects the inadequacy of traditional modes of measurement when considering ARP, with assessments of 'significance' even more difficult to imagine through such criteria.

However, the reduction of impact to purely economic considerations is by no means the only option available to ARP. While there is certainly no shortage of impact measurement schema in terms of empirical scientific research, many research fields that are based in practice, including those in the social sciences, have developed or are developing robust systems for measuring their impact across a networked range of indicators (Harlock 2013; Werner 2012; Epstein and Yuthas 2014; *Framework* 2012). These efforts often involve an attempt to carefully distinguish between research *outputs* – essentially "countable units" – and research *outcomes*, such as "improved confidence" or "improved well-being" (Harlock 2013, 11), along with efforts to develop appropriately flexible and sensitive assessment instruments. The interdisciplinary nature of much ARP activity potentially opens itself to the transfer and adaptation of the best (i.e., most appropriate) of these strategies.

Arguably, however, even these nuances direct evaluating attention towards "end products" ("Glossary"), fixed (if not necessarily final) points of impact in pursuit of stable moments of measurement. Here, Fleishman's citation of Bergson is instructive:

> For, as Bergson makes clear, conventional scientific enquiry is "accustomed . . . to think the moving by means of the unmovable". It is always focused on "immobilities", on stable points or "points of rest" in the movement flow. The intervals between these stable points, "the movements constituting the action itself[,] either elude our consciousness or reach it only confusedly".
>
> (Fleishman 2012, 35)

The challenge for ARP (sp. performance as research), in this interpretation, is to articulate a mode of impact assessment that does indeed address the need to "feel and live the intervals." In what ways can ARP discourse divert attention from end products to the rhythms of in-process becoming, from final outputs to utility in iterative application? Indeed, to what degree can the formulation of an ARP-based understanding of impact have, as one of its measures of benefit, a productively contagious effect on impact recognition and assessment throughout other research paradigms?

To this end, multiple voices have proposed an understanding of the workings of ARP-related approaches as part of a larger 'performative turn.' Arlander unpacks this gesture in considerable detail within her concluding essay in this volume, so I will here only touch upon the possibilities in terms of research impact that it grasps towards. While we have endured a great deal of 'turning' in the study of performing arts in the last decade or two, an embrace of this particular gesture can be seen to be significant both literally and figuratively. As Barbara Bolt, championing AR as a paradigmatic shift, explains,

> [T]he performative needs to be understood in terms of the performative *force* of art, that is, its capacity to effect "movement" in thought, word and deed in the individual and social sensorium. These movements enable a reconfiguration of conventions from within rather than outside of convention. Seen in the context of other research paradigms – namely the qualitative and quantitative paradigms of research – I will argue that what is at stake are the possibilities that a performative paradigm offers a new perspective on research not just in the social sciences and humanities, but also in the sciences.
>
> (Bolt 2016, 130)

Embracing Haseman's defiant assertion of the transformative autonomy of "performative research" (referenced earlier in this introduction), Bolt builds her

case on key points of contrast between what she presents (following Heidegger) as "science-as-research" as compared to "art-as-research." The former, she asserts is "constative," in that it "describes/models the world"; its methodology is based upon "repetition of the same," and its interpretation of the world relies upon "truth as correspondence" (facilitating confirmation or refutation). Conversely, Bolt contends, art-as-research is performative as it "does things in the world"; its methodology is based (concurring with Fleishman) upon "repetition with difference," and its interpretation of the world articulates "'truth' as force and effect" (ibid., 140).

The resort to binaries is both familiar and, by definition, reductive (something the latter part of Bolt's essay complicates effectively); more pertinent to this discussion is the explicit attempt to articulate impact as "the *movement* in concepts, understandings, methodologies, material practice, affect and sensorial experience that arises in and through the research experience" (Bolt 2016, 141, emphasis in original). Accordingly, the criteria of impact measurement that Bolt proposes are all articulated as indications of "shift," "work [. . .] do(ne), "a/effect," and "emerge(nce)" (ibid., 141). In this interpretation, how much and, even more important, *how* things have moved, rather than where they have landed, become the most meaningful measures of impact. Ultimately, extending the benefits of this reorientation beyond AR contexts, Bolt proposes that such a shift potentially holds the key to bypassing the "'flaw' in the very procedures through which science-as-research aims to establish its truth claims. In science, as in art, we might suggest that the paradigmatic shifts have occurred through this mutability rather than repetition of the same" (ibid., 138).

Stopping short of proposing a solution for the "flaw" in scientific research practices, and without asserting, with Bolt, a fundamental paradigmatic shift, the benefits of encircling the elusive concept of artistic research in performance from these three interrelated lenses of knowledge, methods, and impact are ample and highly instructive. The suggestion that ARP has the potential to enhance and expand the epistemological horizons of legitimate knowledge discovery/creation is, by now, a familiar one, yet also one that warrants both regular repeating and persuasive qualification. Such qualification is found, I believe, in the recognition that both the processes *and* the products of ARP are *animate*, their value located in, accomplished through, and measurable by qualities of *movement* (shift, emergence, effort, force, e/affect, etc.), rather than by the distance traveled or the destination reached. These observations do not, necessarily, in themselves solve the 'hard sell' of research validity, but they do offer a conceptual framework for the *kinds of specificity* to which ARP practitioners can productively attend in their efforts towards articulation.

Each of the essays in this collection is one such gesture. Each presents a 'study in motion' – a transition out of the generalized characteristics of what I have here been referring to as artistic research in performance into a detailed consideration of a distinct 'line of flight.' Each offers a unique attempt to trace a particular instance or aspect of emergence, to recognize its knowledge contribution and gauge its impact by

attending with rigorous specificity in pursuit of a precision of articulation. The diversity of subject matter, point of departure, and approach is conspicuous, resulting in a shifting, continuously negotiated constellation of relationships between performance, practice, and research. The answer that they collectively offer to the question that provides the title to this introduction . . . remains a work-in-progress.

Notes

1 "Now, this particular contest narrative, while politically expedient at certain key moments in terms of certain immediate struggles within the academy, and while both complicating and clarifying an understanding of the workings of the binary described above, tends perversely to reinforce and propagate the very binaries and dualities that the political project is trying to do away with" (2012, 30).

2 "This idea of duration informs Bergson's notion of 'creative evolution'. In his book *Creative Evolution*, Bergson rejects both neo-Darwinian mechanism, in which evolution is driven by a pre-existent model or latent code that plays itself out mechanistically over time (a compulsion of the past), and neo-Lamarckian finalism, in which evolution works towards a perfect form achieved at the 'end' (the attraction of the future). Instead he suggests that evolution is a process of constant invention (a series of explosions) in which contingency plays a significant role. For evolution to take place requires only two things: an accumulation of energy and 'an elastic canalization of this energy in variable and indeterminable directions'" (Fleishman 2012, 33).

3 Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 293.

4 Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, p. 327.

References

Allengue, Ludivine, Simon Jones, Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini, eds. *Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2009.

Arlander, Annette. "Artistic Research – From Apartness to the Umbrella Concept at the Theatre Academy, Finland." In Riley and Hunter, 2009. p. 77–83.

Auslander, Philip. *Liveness*. London: Routledge, 1999, 2008.

Austin, John Langshaw (JL). *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt, eds. *Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Inquiry*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.

Barton, Bruce. "Paradox as Process: Intermedial Anxiety and the Betrayals of Intimacy." *Theatre Journal* 61.4 (2009): 575–601.

———. "Subjectivity<>Culture<>Communications<>Intermedia: A Meditation on the 'Impure Interactions' of Performance and the 'in-Between' Space of Intimacy in a Wired World." *Theatre Research in Canada* 29.1 (2008): 51–92.

Barton, Bruce, Melanie Dreyer-Lude and Anna Birch, eds. *Mediating Practice(s): Performance as Research and/in/Through Mediation*. Experiments and Intensities Series. Winchester: University of Winchester Press, 2013.

Bergson, Henri. *Creative Evolution*. Trans. Arthur Mitchell. New York: Random House, 1944.

Birringer, Johannes. "The New Digital Materialism." *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art* 37.3 (2015): 102–110.

———. *Performance, Science, and Technology*. Cambridge: PAJ, 2008.

Bolt, Barbara. "Artistic Research: A Performative Paradigm?" *Parse* 3 (July 2016). Web. http://parsejournal.com/article/artistic-research-a-performative-paradigm/

Borgdorff, Henk. *The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia.* Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012.

———. "The Debate on Research in the Arts." Bergen: Kunsthøgskolen i Bergen, 2006. Web. www.ips.gu.se/digitalAssets/1322/1322713_the_debate_on_research_in_the_arts.pdf

———. "The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research." In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, eds. London: Routledge, 2010. p. 44–63.

Cahill, Tom and Mark Bazzaco. "There Is No Easy Way to Measure the Impact of University Research on Society." *The Conversation* (December 2, 2015). Web. http://the conversation.com/there-is-no-easy-way-to-measure-the-impact-of-university-research-on-society-50856.

Candy, Linda. "Practice-based Research: A Guide." *Creativity and Cognitions Studio Report.* V1.0 (November 2006): 3. Web. https://www.creativityandcognition.com/resources/PBR%20Guide-1.1-2006.pdf

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Dixon, Steve. "Cybernetic-Existentialism." *International Journal of Performance Art and Digital Media* 12.1 (2016): 11–30.

———. *Digital Performance: A History of New Media in Theater, Dance, Performance Art, and Installation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.

Epstein, Mark J. and Kristi Yuthas. *Measuring and Improving Social Impacts: A Guide for Nonprofits, Companies, and Impact Investors.* Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2014.

Fleishman, Mark. "The Difference of Performance as Research." *Theatre Research International* 37.1 (2012): 28–37.

Framework for Measuring Impact. University of Stirling, 2012. Web. http://measuringimpact.org.

Friberg, Carsten and Rose Parekh-Gaihede with Bruce Barton, eds. *At the Intersection Between Art and Research: Practice-Based Research in the Performing Arts.* Malmö, Sweden: NSUP, 2010.

"Glossary." *Framework for Measuring Impact.* University of Stirling. Web. http://measuringimpact.org/glossary.

Hannula, Mikka, Juha Souoranta and Tere Vadén. *Artistic Research: Methodology.* Brussels: Peter Lang, 2014.

Hansen, Pil and Bruce Barton. "Research-Based Practice: Situating Vertical City Between Artistic Development and Applied Cognitive Science." *TDR: The Drama Review* 53.4 (2009): 120–136.

Harlock, Jenny. "Impact Measurement Practice in the UK Third Sector: A Review of Emerging Evidence." *Third Sector Research Centre.* Working Paper 106 (July, 2013).

Haseman, Brad. "A Manifesto for Performative Research." *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy: Quarterly Journal of Media Research and Resources* 118 (2006): 98–106.

Hawkins, Barbara and Brett Wilson. "A Fresh Theoretical Perspective on Practice-Led Research." *The International Journal of Art and Design Education* 36.1 (2016): 82–91.

Hunter, Lynette. "Situated Knowledge." In *Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies.* Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter, eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 151–153.

Jackson, Shannon. "When Is Art Research?" In *Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies.* Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter, eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 157–163.

Jones, Simon. "The Courage of Complementarity: Practice as Research as a Paradigm Shift in Performance Studies." In *Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen*. Ludvine Allengue Simon Jones, Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini, eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 18–33.

Kershaw, Baz and Heather Nicholson. *Research Methods in Theatre and Performance*. Research Methods for the Arts and Humanities series. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Kjørup, Søren. "Pleading for Plurality: Artistic and Other Kinds of Research." In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, eds. London: Routledge, 2012. p. 24–43.

Klein, Julien. "What Is Artistic Research?" *Research Catalogue* (2010). p. 1–6. Web. https://media.researchcatalogue.net/rc/master/5785/5785bf295ddfff55902b08051f9c1143.pdf.

Lesage, Dieter. "PaR in Continental Europe: A Site of Many Contests." In *Practice as Research in the Arts*. Robin Nelson, Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2013. p. 142–51.

MacCallum, Lindsey. "Arts Informed Research." *Mount Saint Vincent University* (2016). Web. http://libguides.msvu.ca/arts-informed-research.

Nelson, Robin. "Modes of Practice-as-Research Knowledge and Their Place in the Academy." In *Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen*. Ludvine Allengue, Simon Jones, Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini, eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 112–31.

———. *Practice as Research in the Arts*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave, 2013.

———. "Practice as Research and the Problem of Knowledge." *Performance Research* 11.4 (2006): 105–16.

"Overview." *Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006*. Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/introduction.htm.

Pape, Sidsel. "Introduction." In *At the Intersection Between Art and Research*: *Practice-Based Research in the Performing Arts*. Carsten Friberg and Rose Parekh-Gaihede with Bruce Barton, eds. Malmö, Sweden: NSUP, 2010. p. 9–12.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Piccini, Angela. "An Historiographic Perspective on Practice as Research." *Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006* (2002). Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/t_ap.htm.

"Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014." *UCL Communications and Marketing*. Web. www.ucl.ac.uk/ref2014/.

Riley, Shannon Rose and Lynette Hunter, eds. *Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2009.

Rye, Caroline. "Incorporating Practice: A Multi-Viewpoint Approach to Performance Documentation." *Journal of Media Practice* 3.2 (2003): 115–123. *Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006*. Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/s_cr.htm.

Scott, Joanee. *Intermedial Praxis and Performance as Research*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2016.

Werner, James L. "Measuring the Impact of Practice-based Research Networks (PBRNs)." *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* (July 2012). Web. http://jabfm.org/content/25/5/557.full.

"Workshops on the Impacts of Research in the Practice-based Creative and Performing Arts, the Humanities and Social Sciences." *Summary Paper*. Research Excellence Framework. December 2010.

Introduction I: Wherefore PAR?

Allengue, Ludivine , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini , eds. Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2009.

Arlander, Annette. “Artistic Research – From Apartness to the Umbrella Concept at the Theatre Academy, Finland.” In Riley and Hunter , 2009. p. 77–83.

Auslander, Philip. Liveness. London: Routledge, 1999, 2008.

Austin, John Langshaw (JL). How to Do Things With Words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt , eds. Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Inquiry. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.

Barton, Bruce. “Paradox as Process: Intermedial Anxiety and the Betrayals of Intimacy.” Theatre Journal 61.4 (2009): 575–601.

Barton, Bruce. . “Subjectivity <> Culture <> Communications<>Intermedia: A Meditation on the ‘Impure Interactions’ of Performance and the ‘in-Between’ Space of Intimacy in a Wired World.” Theatre Research in Canada 29.1 (2008): 51–92.

Barton, Bruce , Melanie Dreyer-Lude and Anna Birch , eds. Mediating Practice(s): Performance as Research and/in/Through Mediation. Experiments and Intensities Series. Winchester: University of Winchester Press, 2013.

Bergson, Henri. Creative Evolution. Trans. Arthur Mitchell . New York: Random House, 1944.

Birringer, Johannes. “The New Digital Materialism.” PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art 37.3 (2015): 102–110.

Birringer, Johannesc . Performance, Science, and Technology. Cambridge: PAJ, 2008.

Bolt, Barbara. “Artistic Research: A Performative Paradigm?” Parse 3 (July 2016). Web. http://parsejournal.com/article/artistic-research-a-performative-paradigm/

Borgdorff, Henk . The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012.

Borgdorff, Henk . “The Debate on Research in the Arts.” Bergen: Kunsthøgskolen i Bergen, 2006. Web.
www.ips.gu.se/digitalAssets/1322/1322713_the_debate_on_research_in_the_arts.pdf

Borgdorff, Henk . “The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research.” In The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson , eds. London: Routledge, 2010. p. 44–63.

Cahill, Tom and Mark Bazzaco . “There Is No Easy Way to Measure the Impact of University Research on Society.” The Conversation (December 2, 2015). Web. http://the conversation.com/there-is-no-easy-way-to-measure-the-impact-of-university-research-on-society-50856.

Candy, Linda. “Practice-based Research: A Guide.” Creativity and Cognitions Studio Report. V1.0 (November 2006): 3. Web.
https://www.creativityandcognition.com/resources/PBR%20Guide-1.1-2006.pdf

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Trans. Brian Massumi . Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Dixon, Steve. “Cybernetic-Existentialism.” International Journal of Performance Art and Digital Media 12.1 (2016): 11–30.

Dixon, Steve. . Digital Performance: A History of New Media in Theater, Dance, Performance Art, and Installation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.

Epstein, Mark J. and Kristi Yuthas. Measuring and Improving Social Impacts: A Guide for Nonprofits, Companies, and Impact Investors. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2014.

Fleishman, Mark. “The Difference of Performance as Research.” Theatre Research International 37.1 (2012): 28–37.

Framework for Measuring Impact. University of Stirling, 2012. Web. http://measuringimpact.org.

Friberg, Carsten and Rose Parekh-Gaihede with Bruce Barton , eds. At the Intersection Between Art and Research: Practice-Based Research in the Performing Arts. Malmö, Sweden: NSUP, 2010.

“Glossary.” Framework for Measuring Impact. University of Stirling. Web. http://measuringimpact.org/glossary.

Hannula, Mikka , Juha Souoranta and Tere Vadén . Artistic Research: Methodology. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2014.

Hansen, Pil and Bruce Barton . “Research-Based Practice: Situating Vertical City Between Artistic Development and Applied Cognitive Science.” TDR: The Drama Review 53.4 (2009): 120–136.
Harlock, Jenny. “Impact Measurement Practice in the UK Third Sector: A Review of Emerging Evidence.” Third Sector Research Centre. Working Paper 106 (July, 2013).
Haseman, Brad. “A Manifesto for Performative Research.” Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy: Quarterly Journal of Media Research and Resources 118 (2006): 98–106.
Hawkins, Barbara and Brett Wilson . “A Fresh Theoretical Perspective on Practice-Led Research.” The International Journal of Art and Design Education 36.1 (2016): 82–91.
Hunter, Lynette. “Situated Knowledge.” In Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 151–153.
Jackson, Shannon. “When Is Art Research?” In Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 157–163.
Jones, Simon . “The Courage of Complementarity: Practice as Research as a Paradigm Shift in Performance Studies.” In Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. Ludvine Allengue Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini , eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 18–33.
Kershaw, Baz and Heather Nicholson. Research Methods in Theatre and Performance. Research Methods for the Arts and Humanities series. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
Kjørup, Søren. “Pleading for Plurality: Artistic and Other Kinds of Research.” In The Rout-ledge Companion to Research in the Arts. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson , eds. London: Routledge, 2012. p. 24–43.
Klein, Julien. “What Is Artistic Research?” Research Catalogue (2010). p. 1–6. Web. https://media.researchcatalogue.net/rc/master/5785/5785bf295ddfff55902b08051f9c1143.pdf.
Lesage, Dieter. “PaR in Continental Europe: A Site of Many Contests.” In Practice as Research in the Arts. Robin Nelson, Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2013. p. 142–151.
MacCallum, Lindsey. “Arts Informed Research.” Mount Saint Vincent University (2016). Web. http://libguides.msvu.ca/arts-informed-research.
Nelson, Robin. “Modes of Practice-as-Research Knowledge and Their Place in the Academy.” In Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. Ludvine Allengue , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini , eds. Houndsmills: Palgrave, 2009. p. 112–131.
Nelson, Robin. . Practice as Research in the Arts. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave, 2013.
Nelson, Robin. . “Practice as Research and the Problem of Knowledge.” Performance Research 11.4 (2006): 105–116.
“Overview.” Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006. Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/introduction.htm.
Pape, Sidsel. “Introduction.” In At the Intersection Between Art and Research:Practice-Based Research in the Performing Arts. Carsten Friberg and Rose Parekh-Gaihede with Bruce Barton , eds. Malmö, Sweden: NSUP, 2010. p. 9–12.
Phelan, Peggy. Unmarked: The Politics of Performance. London: Routledge, 1993.
Piccini, Angela. “An Historiographic Perspective on Practice as Research.” Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006 (2002). Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/t_ap.htm.
“ Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014.” UCL Communications and Marketing. Web. www.ucl.ac.uk/ref2014/.
Riley, Shannon Rose and Lynette Hunter , eds. Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2009.
Rye, Caroline. “Incorporating Practice: A Multi-Viewpoint Approach to Performance Documentation.” Journal of Media Practice 3.2 (2003): 115–123. *Practice as Research in Performance: 2001–2006*. Web. www.bris.ac.uk/parip/s_cr.htm.
Scott, Joanee. Intermedial Praxis and Performance as Research. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2016.
Werner, James L. “Measuring the Impact of Practice-based Research Networks (PBRNs).” Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine (July 2012). Web. http://jabfm.org/content/25/5/557.full.
“Workshops on the Impacts of Research in the Practice-based Creative and Performing Arts, the Humanities and Social Sciences.” Summary Paper. Research Excellence Framework.

December 2010.

On PAR

Bailes, Sara Jane (2011) Performance Theatre and the Poetics of Failure: Forced Entertainment, Goat Island and Elevator Repair Service, London: Routledge.

Bateson, Gregory (2000/1972) Steps to an Ecology of Mind, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beckett, Samuel (1983) Worstward Ho, London: John Calder.

Borgdorff, Henk (2012) The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia, Amsterdam: Leiden University Press.

Bottoms, Stephen (2015) Performance Footprint: 'Psi Meadow Meander (Leeds)', http://performancefootprint.co.uk/projects/earthrise-repair-shop/psi-meadow-meander-leeds/ Accessed 21 November 2016.

Brook, Peter (1987) The Shifting Point: Forty Years of Theatrical Exploration 1946–1987, London: Methuen.

Daniel, Henry (2009) 'Transnet: A Canadian-based Case Study on Practice-as-Research, or Rethinking Dance in a Knowledge-based Economy', in Practice as Research in Performance and Screen, eds. Ludivine Allegue , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini , Basing-stoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Frodeman, Robert (ed.) (2010) The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frodeman, Robert (ed.) (2014) Sustainable Knowledge: A Theory of Interdisciplinarity, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Halberstam, Judith (2011) The Queer Art of Failure, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Heron, Jonathan (2015) 'Shakespearean Laboratories and Performance-as-Research', in Shakespeare on the University and Campus Stage, ed. Andrew Hartley , Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heron, Jonathan and Nicholas Johnson with Burç Idem Dincel , Gavin Quinn , Sarah Jane Scaife and Áine Josephine Tyrrell (2014) 'The Samuel Beckett Laboratory 2013', Journal of Beckett Studies 23:1, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 73–94.

Kershaw, Baz (2009a) 'Performance Practice as Research: Perspectives From a Small Island', in Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies, eds. Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kershaw, Baz (2009b) 'Practice-as-Research: An Introduction', in Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen, eds. Ludivine Allegue and Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw , Angela Piccini , Basing-stoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kershaw, Baz (2011) 'Earthrise Repair Shop', http://performancefootprint.co.uk/projects/earthrise-repair-shop/ Accessed 21 November 2016.

Kershaw, Baz (2012) '"This Is the Way the World Ends, Not …?": On Performance Compulsion and Climate Change', Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts, 17.4, p. 5–17.

Kershaw, Baz (2015) 'Performed By Ecology: How Homo Sapiens Could Subvert Present Day Futures', Performing Ethos: An International Journal of Ethics in Theatre and Performance, 4.2, p. 113–134.

Kershaw, Baz with Lee Miller / Joanne 'Bob' Whalley and Rosemary Lee / Niki Pollard (2011) 'Practice as Research: Transdisciplinary Innovation in Action', in Research Methods in Theatre and Performance, eds. Baz Kershaw and Helen Nicholson , Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kershaw, Baz and Helen Nicholson , eds. (2011) Research Methods in Theatre and Performance, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Monk, Nicholas with Carol Chillington-Rutter , Jonothan Neelands and Jonathan Heron (2011) Open-Space Learning: A Study in Transdisciplinary Pedagogy, London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Nicholson, Helen (2011) Theatre, Education and Performance, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nicolescu, Basarab (ed.) (2008) Transdisciplinarity: Theory and Practice, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
Pavis, Patrice (1992) Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture, London: Routledge.
Shepherd-Barr, Kirsten (2006) Science on Stage: From Doctor Faustus to Copenhagen, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Research-based practice

Allegue, Ludivine , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw , and Angela Piccini . Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009.
Blair, Rhonda. The Actor, Image, and Action: Acting and Cognitive Neuroscience. Oxon: Routledge, 2008.
Boyd, Ian. “Studying Complexity: Are We Approaching the Limits of Science?” Interdisciplinary Research: Diverse Approaches in Science, Technology, Health, and Society. Ed. John Atkinson and Malcolm Crove . Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2006. 25–40.
Cherulnik, Paul D. “An Overview of the Research Process.” Methods for Behavioral Research: A Systematic Approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2001. Chapter 1: 1–21.
Cook, Amy. Shakespearean Neuroplay: Reinvigorating the Study of Dramatic Texts and Performance Through Cognitive Science. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010.
Crave. Choreographed by Karen Kaeja, dramaturged by Pil Hansen, danced by Stephanie Tremblay Abubo and Michael Caldwell to music by Sarah Shugarman. Produced by Kaeja d’Dance, Habourfront Theatre Next Steps, Enwave, Toronto, Canada, 2013. Performance.
Edelman, Gerald M. and Giulio Tononi . A Universe of Consciousness. New York: Basic Books, 2000
Foster, Susan Leigh. “Making a Dance/Researching Through Movement.” Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Ed. Shannon Rose Riley and Lynnette Hunter . Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009. 91–97.
Fuchs, A. and V.K. Jirsa , eds. Coordination: Neural, Behavioral and Social Dynamics. Heidelberg: Springer, 2008.
Ginsborg, J. “Beating Time: The Role of Kinaesthetic Learning in the Development of Mental Representations for Music.” Art in Motion. Ed. A. Mornell . Vienna: Peter Lang, 2009. 121–142.
Hacking, Ian. “The Rationality of Science After Kuhn.” Scientific Inquiry – Readings in the Philosophy of Science. Ed. Robert Klee . New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 216–227.
Haken, H. “Synergistics: An Approach to Self-Organization.” Self-Organizing Systems: The Emergence of Order. Ed. F.E. Yates . New York: Plenum Press, 1987. 417–435.
Hansen, Pil. “Dancing Performance Generating Systems.” Theatre Topics on Dramaturgy 24.3 (Sept 2014): 255–261.
Hansen, Pil. “The Dramaturgy of Performance Generating Systems.” Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement. Ed. Pil Hansen and Darcey Callison . Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2015. 124–143.
Hansen, Pil. “Perceptual Dramaturgy: Swimmer (68).” Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism XXV.2 (Spring 2011): 107–124.
Hansen, Pil and Bruce Barton . “Research-Based Practice: Situating Vertical City Between Artistic Development and Applied Cognitive Science.” TDR: The Drama Review 53.4 (2009): 120–136.
Hansen, Pil with Ame Henderson. “Processing Memory in 300 TAPES and Relay.” Canadian Performance Review on Memory 14.5 (Winter 2011): 11–20.
Hansen, Pil with Christopher House. “Scoring the Generating Principles of Performance Systems.” Performance Research: On An/Notation 20.6 (Oct 2015): 65–73.
Hansen, Pil with Karen Kaeja and Ame Henderson . “Self-Organization and Transition in Systems of Dance Generation.” With Contributions by Karen Kaeja and Ame Henderson. Performance Research on Turbulence 19.5 (Oct 2014): 23–33.
Kelso, J.A.S. Dynamic Patterns: The Self-Organization of Brain and Behavior. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.

Kershaw, Baz . “Practice-as-Research: An Introduction.” Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. Ed. Ludivine Allegue , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini . Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009. 1–17.

Lepecki, Andre. “Errancy as Work: Seven Strewn Notes for Dance Dramaturgy.” Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2015. 51–66.

Lutterbie, John. Towards a General Theory of Acting: Cognitive Science and Performance. Basing-stoke: Palgrave, 2011.

Midgelow, Vida. “Improvisation Practices and Dramaturgical Consciousness: A Workshop.” Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness, and Engagement. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2015. 106–123.

Minnameier, Gerhard. “Peirce-suit of Truth: Why Inference to the Best Explanation and Abduction Ought Not Be Confused.” Erkenntnis 60.1 (2004): 75–105.

Motion Bank . Dance Notation and Research Website Produced by Scott deLahunta at the Prior Forsythe Company. http://motionbank.org/en/content/dance-engaging-science. Visited July 15, 2015.

Nelson, Robin. Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2013.

Popper, Karl. “Falsificationism.” Scientific Inquiry – Readings in the Philosophy of Science. Ed. Robert Klee . New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 65–71.

Port, Robert F. and Timothy Van Gelder , eds. Mind as Motion: Explorations in the Dynamics of Cognition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.

Relay. Choreographed by Ame Henderson (with the ensemble). Perf. Katie Ewald, Matija Ferlin, Claudia Fancello, Marie Claire Forté, Mairéad Filgate, Barbara Pallomina, Brendan Jensen, and Chad Dembski. Harbourfront World Stage at the Enwave Theatre, Toronto. April 2010. Performance.

Shaughnessy, Nicola. “Knowing Me Knowing You: Cognition, Kinesthetic Empathy and Applied Performance.” Kinesthetic Empathy in Creative and Cultural Practices. Ed. Dee Reynolds and Matthew Reason . Bristol: Intellect, 2012. 33–50.

Stevens, C. , R. Dean , K. Vincs , and E. Schubert . “In the Heat of the Moment: Audience Real-Time Response to Music and Dance Performance.” Coughing and Clapping: Investigating Audience Experience. Ed. Karen Burland and Stephanie Pitts . Farnham: Ashgate, 2014. 69–88.

Stevens, C. , J. Ginsborg , and G. Lester . “Backwards and Forwards in Space and Time: Recalling Dance Movement From Long-term Memory.” Memory Studies 4 (2011): 234–250.

Thelen, Esther and Linda B. Smith . A Dynamic Systems Approach to the Development of Cognition and Action. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.

Trace. Directed by Bruce Barton with the devisors Michelle Polak and Martin Julien. Dramaturgy by Pil Hansen. Co-produced by Vertical City Performance and Theatre Gargantua. Sommerworks Festival, Toronto, Canada 2014. Performance.

Tribble, Evelyn and John Sutton . “Cognitive Ecologies as a Framework for Shakespearean Studies.” Shakespeare Studies 39 (2011): 94–103.

Van Gelder, T. “What Might Cognition Be, If Not Computation?” Journal of Philosophy 92.7 (July 1995): 345–381.

Vass-Rhee, Freya. “In the Meta-, Somewhat Eluviated: Critiquing Interdisciplinary Metaphors Through Arts-Sciences Research” On the Panel “Why Stratify?: Inter/intra-disciplinary Methodologies for Studying Cognitive Processes through Performance.” International Federation of Theatre Research’s Annual Conference, Warwick, 2014.

Waterhouse, Elizabeth , Riley Watts , and Bettina E. Blasing . “Doing Duo – A Case Study of Entrainment in William Forsythe’s Choreography ‘Duo.’” Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 8 (Oct 2014): article 812. www.frontiersin.org. Visited July 15, 2015.

What We Are Saying. Created and performed by Ame Henderson, Frank Cox-O’Connell, Katie Ewald, Mairéad Filgate, Sherri Hay, Ame Henderson, Sandra Henderson, Brendan Jensen, Alexander MacSween, Liz Peterson, Bojana Stancic, Stephen Thompson and Evan Webber. Co-produced by public Recordings, Dance4 (Nottingham), Festival TransAmériques (Montreal) and Harbourfront Centre World Stage. The Power Plant Contemporary Art Gallery, Toronto, Canada, 2013. Performance.

Winners and Losers. Created and performed by James Long and Marcus Youssef. Co-produced by Theatre Replacement and New World Theatre. The Gateway Theatre, Richmond BC, Canada, 2012. Performance.

The daisy chain model

Barrett, E. and B. D. Bolt . (2007). Practice as research: approaches to creative arts enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris.

Barrett, E. and B. D. Bolt . (2014). Material inventions: applying creative arts research. London: I.B. Tauris.

Bial, H. (2004). The performance studies reader. London: Routledge.

Broadhurst, S. (1999). Liminal acts: a critical overview of contemporary performance and theory. London: Cassell.

Bucknall, J. (2007). Siren Song Experiments. http://sirensongin3parts.blogspot.com, last accessed on 15th March 2016.

Bucknall, J. (2013). 'You, hope, her & me: liminoid invitations and liminoid acts'. Performing Ethos, 3(2), 139–154.

Bucknall, J. (2016). 'Liminoid invitations and liminoid acts: the role of ludic strategies and tropes in immersive and micro-performance dramaturgies'. Performance Research, 21(4), 53.

Bucknall, J. (2017). 'The "reflective participant," "(remember)ing" and "(remember)ance": A (syn)aesthetic approach to the documentation of audience experience'. PARtake: The Journal of Performance as Research, 1 (2), Article 6.

Chandrasekaran, B. , J. R. Josephson and V. Richard Benjamins . (1999). 'What are ontologies, and why do we need them?' IEEE Intelligent Systems 14(1): 20–26.

Childs, N. and J. Walkin (Eds.). (1998). A split second of paradise: live art, installation and performance. London: Rivers Oram Press.

Freeman, J. (2010). Blood, sweat and theory: research through practice in performance. London: Libri.

Haseman, B. (2007). 'Rupture and recognition: identifying the performative research paradigm', eds. Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt , Practice as research: approaches to creative arts enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 147–157.

Ihde, D. (1979). Technics and Praxis. Boston, MA: D. Reidel.

Mackintosh, I. (1992). Architecture, actor, and audience. London: Routledge.

McAuley, G. (1999). Space in performance: making meaning in the theatre. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

McConachie, B. A. and F. E. Hart (2010). Performance and cognition: theatre studies and the cognitive turn. London: Routledge.

Nelson, R. (2013). Practice as research in the arts: principles, protocols, pedagogies, resistances. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pearson, D. (2015). 'Unsustainable acts of love and resistance: the politics of value and cost in one-on-one performances'. Canadian Theatre Review, 162, 63–67.

Piccini, A. (2002). 'Viewpoint on Mackey's "drama, landscape and memory: to be is to be in place". Research in Drama Education, 7(2), 239–242.

Schneider, R. (Summer 2001). 'Archives. Performance remains'. Performance Research, 6(2), 100–108.

Schön, D. A. (1995). Reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action. Bury St. Edmunds: Arena.

Trimingham, M. (2002). 'A methodology for practice as research'. Studies in Theatre and Performance, 22(1), 54.

Turner, V. W. (1982). From ritual to theatre: the human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal.

Turner, V. W. (1986). The anthropology of experience. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

White, G. (2012). 'On immersive theatre'. Theatre Research International, 37(3), 221.

A new rhetoric

Aristotle , 1984. The Complete Works of Aristotle: revised Oxford translation. Edited by Johnathan Barnes . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bolt, Barbara . 2008. A Performative Paradigm for the Creative Arts? *Working Papers in Art and Design* 5.

Bresler, Liora (ed.). 2004. Knowing Bodies, Moving Minds Towards Embodied Teaching and Learning. Dordrecht, Boston, MA, and London: Kluwer Academic.

Foucault, Michel . 2014 [1975]. Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison. Paris: Gallimard

Hannaford, Carla . 2005 [1995]. 7 and 13. In Smart Moves: Why Learning Is Not All In Your Head. Salt Lake City, UT: Great River Books.

Kjørup, Søren . 2002. 'Notes on the Humanities: Material for the Basic Course in Philosophy and Theory of Science and of the Humanities'. International Cultural Studies, Roskilde University, Spring Term.

Kjørup, Søren . 2006. Another Way of Knowing: Baumgarten, Aesthetics, and the Concept of Sensuous Cognition. Sensuous Knowledge 1. Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts.

McKenzie, Jon . 2001. Perform or Else From Discipline to Performance. New York: Routledge.

Mullin, Johan . 2011. Rhetoric: Writing, Reading and Producing the Visual. In Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson (eds.), The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. London: Routledge.

Pfaller, Robert . 2017. Interpassivity: The Aesthetics of Delegated Enjoyment. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

RMIT University . 2014a. prs- CJ Lim [video file] https://vimeo.com/84726131

RMIT University . 2014b. prs- Thierry Kandjee [video file] https://vimeo.com/85316486

RMIT University . 2014c. Tom Holbrook [video file] https://vimeo.com/98989809

RMIT University . 2015. prs- Pedra Pferdmenges [video file] https://vimeo.com/155621980

Spatz, Ben . 2014. Stratum Sediment Self: Embodiment as the Primary Site of Critical Realism. (Performance as Research Working Group IFTR Warwick 2014).

Schmutz, Christina . 2014. Face-to-face//artistic and scientific strategies of new theatre formats. (Performance as Research Working Group IFTR Warwick 2014).

Žižek, Slavoj . 1996. The Plague of Fantasies. London: Verso

Research as theatre (RaT)

Ackerman, Alan , and Martin Puchner, Eds. 2006. Against Theatre: Creative Destructions on the Modernist Stage. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Austin, John L. 1962. How to Do Things With Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Web. Accessed March 10, 2014 from www.metaphilo.fr/Livres/Austin%20%20How%20to%20do%20things%20with%20words.pdf.

Barad, Karen. 2007. Meeting the Universe Halfway. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Barish, Jonas A. 1981. The Antitheatrical Prejudice. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bottoms, Stephen J. 2003. "The efficacy/effeminacy braid: Unpacking the performance studies/theatre studies dichotomy." Theatre Topics 13(2): 173–187.

Butler, Judith . 1988. "Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory." Theatre Journal 40(4): 519–531.

Butler, Judith 1990. Gender Trouble and the Subversion of Identity. London: Routledge.

Butler, Judith 1993. "Critically queer." Gay & Lesbian Quarterly 1: 17–32.

Cabantous, Laure , Jean-Pascal Gond , Nancy Harding , and Mark Learmonth . 2016. "Critical essay: Reconsidering critical performativity." Human Relations 69(2): 197–213.

Callon, Michel. 1998. "Laws of the markets." Sociological Review Monograph 46(S1): 1–272.

Chen, Mel Y. 2012. Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus . 1986. Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Collins, Harry M. 1983. “The sociology of scientific knowledge: Studies of contemporary science.” Annual Review of Sociology 9: 265–285.
Conquergood, Dwight. 1991. “Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics.” Communication Monographs 58(2): 179–196.
Coole, Diana and Samantha Frost, Eds. 2010. New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, Politics. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
Crease, Robert P. 1993. The Play of Nature: Experimentation as Performance. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Daston, Lorraine and Peter Galison . 2007. Objectivity. Brooklyn: Zone Books.
de la Bellacasa, Maria Puig. 2011. “Matters of care in technoscience: Assembling neglected things.” Social Studies of Science 41(1): 85–106.
Dewsbury, John-David. 2000. “Performativity and the event: Enacting a philosophy of difference.” Environment and Planning D Society and Space 18(4): 473–496.
Diamond, Elin. 1997. Unmaking Mimesis: Essays on Feminism and Theater. London: Routledge.
Fitzgerald, Des and Felicity Callard . 2015. “Social science and neuroscience beyond interdisciplinarity: Experimental entanglements.” Theory, Culture & Society 32(1): 3–32.
Gad, Christopher and Jensen, Casper Bruun. 2014. “The Promises of Practice.” The Sociological Review 62(4): 698–718.
Goffman, Erwin . 2012 (1959). “The presentation of self in everyday life.” In ContemporarySociological Theory, 3rd Edition. Edited by Craig Calhoun , Joseph Gerteis , James Moody , Steven Pfaff and Indermohan Virk . 46–61. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
Goffman, Erwin 1981. Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Haraway, Donna. 1997. Modest_Witness@Second_Millenium.FemaleMan©_Meets_Onco-Mouse™. London: Routledge.
Herzig, Rebecca. 2004. “On performance, productivity, and vocabularies of motive in recent studies of science.” Feminist Theory 5(2): 127–147.
Hickman, Louise. 2016. “Distributing Crip Socialities.” Paper presented at the Composing Disability: Crip Ecologies Conference. George Washington University, April 8.
Jackson, Shannon. 2004. Professing Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jensen, Caspar Bruun. 2014. “Experiments in good faith and hopefulness: Toward a post-critical social science.” Common Knowledge 20(2): 337–362.
Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1981. The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Latour, Bruno. 2004. “Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern.” Critical Inquiry 30(2): 225–248.
Latour, Bruno. 2010. “An attempt at a ‘compositionist manifesto’”. New Literary History 41(3): 471–490.
Latour, Bruno and Steven Woolgar . 1986 (1979). Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts, 3rd Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Law, John . 2004. After Method: Mess in Social Science Research. London: Routledge.
Law, John 2009. “Actor network theory and material semiotics.” In The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory. Edited by Bryan S. Turner . 141–158. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
Law, John and Vicky Singleton . 2000. “Performing technology’s stories: On social constructivism, performance and performativity.” Technology and Culture 41(4): 765–775.
Law, John and John Urry . 2004. “Enacting the social.” Economy and Society 33(3): 390–410.
Lynch, Michael. 1985. Art and Artifact in Laboratory Science. London: Routledge & Kegan.
Mead, Margaret and Paul Byers . 1968. The Small Conference: An Innovation in Communication. The Hague: Mouton.
Merton, Robert K. 1938. “Science and the social order.” Philosophy of Science 5(3): 321–337.
Merton, Robert K. 1942. “Science and technology in a democratic order.” Journal of Legal and Political Sociology 1: 115–126.
Mol, Annemarie. 1998. “Missing links, making links: The performance of some artheroscle-roses.” In Differences in Medicine: Unraveling Practices, Techniques and Bodies. Edited by Marc Berg and Annemarie Mol . 144-C65. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mol, Annemarie. 2002. The Body Multiple. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Nelson, Lise. 1999. “Bodies (and spaces) do matter: The limits of performativity.” Gender, Place & Culture 6(4): 331–353.
Nelson, Robin . (Ed.). 2013. Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Peckham, Morse. 1965. Man’s Rage for Chaos. Philadelphia: Chilton Books.
Piccini, Angela and Baz Kershaw . 2004. “Practice as research in performance: From epistemology to evaluation.” Research in Mathematics Education 15(2): 86–92.
Pickering, Andrew. 1995. The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency and Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Pickering, Andrew. 2010. The Cybernetic Brain: Sketches of Another Future. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Puchner, Martin. 2002. Stage Fright: Modernism, Anti-theatricality, and Drama. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Ridout, Nicolas. 2006. Stage Fright, Animals, and Other Theatrical Problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Riley, Shannon Rose. 2013. “Why Performance as Research?—A U.S. Perspective.” In Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances, Edited by Robin Nelson . 175–187. New York and Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
Riley, Shannon Rose and Lynette Hunter (Eds.). 2009. Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schatzki, Theodore R. , Karin Knorr-Cetina and Eike von Savigny . 2001. The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory. London: Routledge. Society for the Social Studies of Science Website. Past Officers Page. Accessed December 2, 2015 from www.4sonline.org/past_officers.
Suchman, Lucy. 2007. Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Traweek, Sharon. 1988. Beamtimes and Lifetimes: The World of High Energy Physicists. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Worthen, William B. 1998. “Drama, performativity, and performance.” PMLA 113(5): 1093–1107.
Zammito, John H. 2004. A Nice Derangement of Epistemes: Post-Positivism in the Study of Science From Quine to Latour. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Zuierent-Jerak, Teun. 2015. Situated Intervention: Sociological Experiments in Health Care. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Agential cuts and performance as research

Arlander, Annette (2014). From interaction to intra-action in performing landscape. In Beatriz Revelles Benavente , Ana M. González Ramos , Krizia Nardini (coord.). New feminist materialism: Engendering an ethic-onto-epistemological methodology. Art-nodes, 14, pp. 26–34. Available at: http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Artnodes/article/viewFile/303309/392962
Barad, Karen (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28(3), pp. 801–831.Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/345321
Barad, Karen (2007). Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Barad, Karen (2012). Intra-actions. Mousse, 34, pp. 76–81. (Interview of Karen Barad by Adam Kleinmann). Available at: www.academia.edu/1857617/_Intra-actions_Interview_of_Karen_Barad_by_Adam_Kleinmann_
Bennett, Jane (2015). Systems and things: On vital materialism and object-oriented philosophy. In Richard Grusin (ed.) The Nonhuman Turn. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 223–240.
Bolt, Barbara (2004). Art Beyond Representation: The Performative Power of the Image. London: I.B. Tauris.
Bolt, Barbara (2008). A performative paradigm for the creative arts? Working Papers in Art and Design, Volume 5. Available at:

http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol5/bbabs.html
Conquergood, Dwight (2004 [1999]). Performance studies. Interventions and radical research. In Henry Bial (eds.) The Performance Studies Reader. London: Routledge, pp. 311–322.
Hannula, Mika , Suoranta, Juha and Vadén, Tere (2005). Artistic Research – Theories, Methods and Practices. Helsinki: Academy of Fine Art and Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
Johnson, Mark (2011). Embodied knowing through art. In Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson (eds.) The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. London: Routledge, pp. 141–151.
Kershaw, Baz (2007). Theatre Ecology – Environments and Performance Events. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nevanlinna, Tuomas (2004). Is artistic research a meaningful concept. In Annette W. Balkema and Henk Slager (eds.) Artistic Research: Lier en Boog Series of Philosophy of Art and Art Theory, Volume 18. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., pp. 80–83.
O-zone/A Journal of Object-oriented Studies. Available at: o-zone-journal.org
Riley, Shannon Rose and Hunter, Lynette (eds.) (2009). Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research – Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schwab, Michael (2013). Introduction. In Michael Schwab (ed.) Experimental Systems: Future Knowledge in Artistic Research. Leuven: Leuven University Press, pp. 5–14.
Spatz, Ben (2015) What a Body Can Do: Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research. London: Routledge.
Van der Tuin, Iris (2014). The mode of invention in creative research: Onto-epistemology. In Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds.) Material Inventions: Applying Creative Arts Research. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 257–272.

Antromovimento

Bharucha, Rustom . (1996). “Somebody’s Other: Disorientations in the Cultural Politics of Our Times.” In Patrice Pavis , Ed. The Intercultural Performance Reader. London: Routledge.
Conquergood, Dwight . (2013) “Performing as a Moral Act.” In Dwight Conquergood and E. Patrick Johnson , Eds. Cultural Struggles: Performance, Ethnography, Praxis. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Daniel, Yvonne . (2005). Dancing Wisdom: Embodied Knowledge in Haitian Vodou, Cuban Yoruba, and Bahian Candomblé. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Foster, Susan Leigh (Ed.). (2009). Worlding Dance. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Geertz, Clifford . (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.
González, María Cristina . (2000). “The Four Seasons of Ethnography: A Creation-Centered Ontology for Ethnography.” International Journal of Intercultural Relations. Vol. 24, 623–650.
González, María Cristina . (2003). “An Ethics for Postcolonial Ethnography.” In R.P. Claire , Ed. Expressions of Ethnography: Novel Approaches to Qualitative Methods. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Knowles, Ric . (2010). Theatre & Interculturalism. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
Pavis, Patrice . (1996). The Intercultural Performance Reader. London; New York: Routledge.
Peters, Julie Stone . (1995). “Intercultural Performance, Theatre Anthropology, and the Imperialist Critique: Identities, Inheritances, and Neo-Orthodoxies.” In J. Ellen Gainor , Ed. Imperialism and Theatre: Essays on World Theatre, Drama, and Performance. London: Routledge.
Porter, Laurelann . (2014). “Dismantling Illusions in and of Paradise Through the Gift of Refraction in the Terra do Exú: An Ethnography with Women of Rural Bahia.” Diss. Arizona State University.
Reis, João José and Gomes and Flávio dos Santos (Eds.). (1996). Liberdade por um fio: história dos quilombos no Brasil. São Paulo: Cia. Das Letras.
Roach, Joseph . (2010). “Kinesis: The New Mimesis.” In Emily Coates and Joseph Roach , Eds. Postglobal Dance. Spec. Issue of Theater. Vol. 40, Issue 1.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty . (1992). “The Politics of Translation.” In Lawrence Venuti , Ed. (2000). The Translation Studies Reader, 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.

Taylor, Diana. (2003). The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

PAR and decolonisation

Auslander, Philip (2002) From Acting to Performance: Essays in Modernism and Postmodernism, London and New York: Routledge.
Bandhopadhyay, Samik (2012) Seminar, Theatre and Performance Studies Forum, New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University.
Benston, Kimberly W. (1984) 'I yam what I am: The topos of un (naming) in Afro-American literature,' in Black Literature and Literary Theory, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. , New York: Routledge.
Berg, Maggie and Barbara K. Seeber (2016) The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Bhattacharya, Debaditya (2016) 'What "use" is the liberal ruse? Debating the "idea" of the university,' Café Dissensus 29, Special Issue: The Idea of the University. Online: <https://cafedissensus.com/2016/09/15/contents-the-idea-of-the-university-issue-29/>.
Collini, Stefan (2012) What Are Universities For? London: Penguin Books.
Derrida, Jacques (1978) 'The theatre of cruelty and the closure of representation,' in Writing and Difference, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Gayatri, Manola K. (2014). Breath, Radical Faith and Intersubjectivity in Poetic Utterance, PhD Thesis, New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University.
Gokhale, Shantha. (2014) The Theatre of Veenapani Chawla, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Habib, Adam (2016) 'The unrest of the South African psyche', Keynote address, Annual Consulting Psychology Conference, Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
Irigaray, Luce (2002) To Be Two, London: Bloomsbury.
Nair, Sreenath (2007) Restoration of Breath Consciousness and Performance, New York: Rodopi.
Phelan, Peggy (1993) Unmarked: The Politics of Performance, New York: Routledge.
Wartofsky, Marx (1979) Models: Representations and the Scientific Understanding, Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Containers of practice

Barba, Eugenio. 1997. "An Amulet Made of Memory: The Significance of Exercises in the Actor's Dramaturgy." TDR 41 (4): 127–132.
Barba, Eugenio. 2002. "Actor's Training (1959–1962)". In Towards a Poor Theatre. New York: Routledge.
Buckley, Richard and Eric Carle . 2009. The Foolish Tortoise. London: Simon and Schuster.
Cambray, Joseph and Linda Carter . 2004. Analytical Psychology: Contemporary Perspectives in Jungian Analysis. Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
Carnicke, Sharon Marie and Jean Benedetti . 1993. "From 'The Actor: Work on Oneself'." TDR 37 (1): 38–42.
Casement, Ann. 1998. Post-Jungians Today: Key Papers in Contemporary Analytical Psychology. London: Routledge.
Christoffersen, Erik Exe. 1993. The Actor's Way. London: Routledge.
Christofferson, Eric Exe. 2004. "Introduction to Peripeti and Serendipity." Peripeti 1 (2): 5–15.
Croyden, Margaret. 1974. "The Phenomenon of Jerzy Grotowski." In The Contemporary Experimental Theatre: Lunatics, Lovers and Poets, 135–168. New York: McGraw Hill.
Cull, Laura. 2009. Deleuze and Performance. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davis, Robert H. 2003. Jung, Freud, Hillman: Three Depth Psychologies in Context. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Debord, Guy. 2006. “Theory of the Dérive.” In Situationist International Anthology, translated and edited by Ken Knabb , 62–66. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. Difference & Repetition. London: Athlone.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1997. “One Less Manifesto.” In Mimesis, Masochism, & Mime: The Politics of Theatricality in Contemporary French Thought, edited by Timothy Murray , 239–258. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Grotowski, Jerzy. 1997a. “Performer.” In The Grotowski Sourcebook, edited by Richard Schechner and Lisa Wolford , 376–380. London: Routledge.
Grotowski, Jerzy . 1997b. “Tu es le fils de quell qu’un.” In The Grotowski Sourcebook, edited by Richard Schechner and Lisa Wolford , 294–305. London: Routledge.
Hauke, Christopher. 2000. Jung and the Postmodern: The Interpretation of Realities. London: Routledge.
Heidegger, Martin. 1993. Basic Writings. New York: Harper Collins.
Hillman, James. 1977. “An Inquiry into Image.” Spring (39): 62–88.
Hillman, James. 2008. Animal Presences. Putnam, CT: Spring.
Hunter, Lynette. 2009. “Valuing Performance/Practice as Academic Knowledge.” In Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies, edited by Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , 199–205. London: Palgrave.
Irigaray, Luce. 1992. Elemental Passions. New York: Routledge.
Kapsali, Maria. 2010. “‘I Don’t Attack It, But It’s Not for Actors’: The Use of Yoga by Jerzy Grotowski.” Theatre, Dance and Performance Training 1 (2): 185–198.
Kershaw, Baz. 2009. “Practice as Research Through Performance.” In Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts, edited by Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean , 104–125. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Kershaw, Baz and Helen Nicholson . 2011. Research Methods in Theatre and Performance. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Kumiega, Jennifer. 1985. The Theatre of Grotowski. London: Methuen.
Pitches, Jonathan , Simon Murray , Helen Poynor , Libby Worth , David Richmond and Jules Dorey Richmond . 2011. “Performer Training: Researching Practice in the Theatre Laboratory.” In Research Methods in Theatre and Performance, edited by Baz Kershaw and Helen Nicholson , 137–162. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Richards, Thomas. 1995. At Work with Grotowski on Physical Actions. London: Routledge.
Riley, Shannon Rose. 2009. “Lab/Studio.” In Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies, edited by Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , 137–141. London: Palgrave.
Samuels, Andrew. 1985. Jung and the Post-Jungians. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Saner, Göze. 2009. From Tyrant to Clown and Back: An Actor’s Practical Study of Archetype in Performance. PhD Thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London.
Schino, Mirella. 2009. Alchemists of the Stage: Theatre Laboratories in Europe. Holstebro: Icarus.
Slowiak, James and Jairo Cuesta . 2007. Jerzy Grotowski. London: Routledge.
Spatz, Ben. 2015. What a Body Can Do: Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research. Oxon: Routledge.
Stanislavski, Konstantin. 1993. The Collected Works of Konstantin Stanislavsky. Translated by Jean Benedetti . New York: Routledge.
Stanislavski, Konstantin. 2008. An Actor’s Work. Translated by Jean Benedetti . Oxon: Routledge.
Stein, Murray and Raya A. Jones . 2010. Cultures and Identities in Transition: Jungian Perspectives. London: Routledge.
Tacey, David. 1998. “Twisting and Turning With James Hillman: From Anima to World Soul, from Academia to Pop.” In Post-Jungians Today: Key Papers in Contemporary Analytical Psychology, edited by Ann Casement , 215–234. London: Routledge.
Vaughan, Kathleen. 2009. “ *Mariposa*: The Story of New Work of Research/Creation, Taking Shape, Taking Flight.” In *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts* , edited by Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean , 166–186. Edinburgh: Edinburgh.

Wangh, Stephen. 2000. An Acrobat of the Heart. New York: Vintage.
Watson, Ian . 2009. “An Actor Prepares: Performance as Research (PAR) in the Theatre.” In Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies, edited by Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter , 84–90. London: Palgrave.
Young-Eisendrath, Polly. 2004. Subject to Change: Jung, Gender and Subjectivity in Psychoanalysis. Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
Erdoğan, Alev . Göçmen Adımlar/Migrant Steps. Documentary Film, 20 minutes. 2014. www.migrantsteps.com/tr/video.
Odin Teatret . Calendar 2011. Webpage. www.odinteatret.dk/arrangementer/2011/december/iben-arbejder-med-the-bridge-of-winds-paa-odin-teatret/ev•de•yol•da–at•home•on•the•road.aspx.
Odin Teatret Web TV . Bridge of Winds 2015. Online Video. 17 January 2015. http://livestream.com/OdinTeatretLiveStreaming/thebridgeofwinds.
Physical Training at Odin Teatret. Directed by Torgeir Wethal. 1972. Denmark: Odin Teatret Film. VHS.
Saner, Göze . Göçmen Adımlar/Migrant Steps. Video Documentation of Live Performance, 35 minutes. 7–9 March 2014. London: North London Community House. www.migrantsteps.com/tr/video.
Saner, Göze . The Journey So Far. Webpage. www.cafila-aeterna.com/the-journey-so-far.html.
Training at the “Teatr Laboratorium” in Wroclaw: Plastic and Physical Training. Directed by Torgeir Wethal. 1972. Denmark: Odin Teatret Film.
Vocal Training at Odin Teatret. Directed by Torgeir Wethal. 1972. Denmark: Odin Teatret Film.

Introduction III: Mad Lab – or why we can’t do practice as research

Allegue, Ludivine , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw , and Angela Piccini , eds. (2009) Practice-as-Research: In Performance and Screen. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Barrett, Estelle , and Barbara Bolt , eds. (2007) Practice as Research: Context, Method, Knowledge. New York: I.B. Tauris.
Bell, Catherine (2007) Teaching Ritual. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bowman, Paul (2015) Martial Arts Studies. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
Boyarin, Jonathan (2008) Jewishness and the Human Dimension. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Carlson, Marvin (1996) Performance: A Critical Introduction. New York: Routledge.
Ingold, Tim (2011) Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description. New York and London: Routledge.
Kapsali, Maria (2014) Theatre, Dance and Performance Training 5.2 (special issue on Training, Politics and Ideology).
Mahmood, Saba (2005) Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Manning, Erin (2016) The Minor Gesture. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Margolis, Ellen and Lissa Tyler Renaud (2010) The Politics of American Actor Training. New York: Routledge.
McKenzie, John (2001) Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance. New York: Routledge.
Oerton, Sarah (2012) ‘“Touch Talk”: The Problems and Paradoxes of Embodied Research’. International Journal of Social Research Methodology 7.4: 305–322.
Pakes, Anna (2010) ‘Original Embodied Knowledge: The Epistemology of the New in Dance Practice as Research’. Research in Dance Education 4.2: 127–149.
Phelan, Peggy (1993) Unmarked: The Politics of Performance. New York: Routledge.
Profeta, Katherine (2015) Dramaturgy in Motion: At Work on Dance and Movement Performance. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Rabinow, Paul (2003) Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Reason, Matthew (2006) Documentation, Disappearance and the Representation of Live Performance. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg with Michael Schwab (2013) ‘Forming and Being Informed’. In Experimental Systems: Future Knowledge in Artistic Research, ed. Michael Schwab , Ghent: Orpheus Institute and Leuven University Press, pp. 199–220.
Riley, Shannon Rose and Lynette Hunter , eds. (2009) Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Saldanha, Arun (2006) ‘Reontologising Race: The Machinic Geography of Phenotype’. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 24: 9–24.
Schatzki, Theodore R. , Karin Knorr Cetina , and Eike von Savigny , eds. (2001) The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory. New York: Routledge.
Schechner, Richard (1988) Performance Theory. New York: Routledge.
Schneider, Rebecca (2011) Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment. New York: Routledge.
Shove, Elizabeth , Frank Trentmann , and Richard Wilk , eds. (2009) Time, Consumption and Everyday Life: Practice, Materiality and Culture. New York: Berg.
Spatz, Ben (2015) What a Body Can Do: Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research. New York: Routledge.
Spatz, Ben (2017) ‘Embodiment as First Affordance: Tinkering, Tuning, Tracking’. Performance Philosophy 2.2: 257–271.
Stoller, Paul (1997) Sensuous Scholarship. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Taylor, Diana and Marcos Steuernagel (2016) What Is Performance? Hemi Press and Duke University Press. Online: <http://scalar.usc.edu/nehvectors/wips/index>.
Thrift, Nigel (2008) Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect. New York: Routledge.
van der Burg, Simone and Tsjalling Swierstra (2013) Ethics on the Laboratory Floor. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Varela, Francisco J. and Jonathan Shear , eds. (1999) The View From Within: First-Person Approaches to the Study of Consciousness. Thorverton and Bowling Green: Imprint Academic/Journal of Consciousness Studies.
Wacquant, Loïc (2006) Body & Soul: Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wangh, Stephen (2000) An Acrobat of the Heart: A Physical Approach to Acting Inspired by the Work of Jerzy Grotowski. New York: Vintage Books.
Warner, Michael (2002) Publics and Counterpublics. New York: Zone Books.
Zeigler, Joseph Wesley (1994) Arts in Crisis: The National Endowment for the Arts Versus America. Chicago: A Cappella Books.

PAR produces plethora, extended voices are plethoric, and why plethora matters

Barthes, Roland. 1991. The grain of the voice. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Behrndt, Synne. 2014. “Dramaturgy and the facilitation of encounters.” Forum Modernes Theater 44:130–141.
Best, Catherine. 1994. “The emergence of native language phonological influences in infants: the perceptual assimilation model.” In The development of speech perception: the transition from speech sounds to spoken words, edited by Judith C. Goodman and Howard C. Nussbaum , 167–224. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Best, Catherine , and Gerald McRoberts . 2003. “Infant perception of non-native consonant contrasts that adults assimilate in different ways.” Language and Speech 46 (2/3):183–216.
Bonenfant, Yvon. 2010. “Queer listening to queer vocal timbres.” Performance Research 15 (3):74–80. doi:10.1080/13528165.2010.527210.
Brown, Steven. 2007. “Contageous heterophony: a new theory about the origins of music.” Musicae Scientiae XI (1):3–26.
Brown, Steven , Elton Ngan , and Mario Liotti . 2008. “A Larynx area in the human motor cortex.” Cerebral Cortex 18:837–845.
Cavarero, Adriana. 2005. For more than one voice: toward a philosophy of vocal expression. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connor, Steven. 2000. Dumbstruck: a cultural history of ventriloquism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Connor, Steven. 2014. Beyond words: sobs, hums, stutters and other vocalizations. London: Reaktion.
Garrett, Leigh. 2013. “What is visual arts research data? (revisited),” https://kaptur.wordpress.com/2013/01/23/what-is-visual-arts-research-data-revisited/, accessed 4 April 2016.
Goldstein, Louis , and Philip Rubin . 2007. “Speech: dances of the vocal tract.” Odyssey Magazine 14–15.
Karikis, Mikhail. 2005. The Acoustics of the Self. PhD Thesis, London: UCL.
Kreiman, Jody , and Diana Sidtis . 2011. Foundations of voice studies: an interdisciplinary approach to voice production and perception. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Labelle, Brandon. 2014. Lexicon of the mouth. London: Bloomsbury.
Leavy, Patricia. 2009. Method meets art. New York: The Guildford Press.
Ledger, Adam K. , Simon K. Ellis , and Fiona Wright . 2011. “The question of documentation: Creative strategies in performance research.” In Research methods in theatre and performance, edited by Baz Kershaw and Helen Nicholson , 162–185. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Nelson, Robin. 2006. “Modes of PaR knowledge and their place in the academy,” accessed 12 April 2017. www.westminster.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/74594/RobinNelson.pdf
Nelson, Robin. 2013. Practice as research in the arts: principles, protocols, pedagogies, resistances. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Olwage, Grant. 2004. “The class and colour of tone: an essay on the social history of vocal timbre.” Ethnomusicology Forum 13 (2):203–226.
Oxford English Dictionary. 2006. www.oed.com, accessed 4 April 2016.
Piccini, Angela , and Caroline Rye . 2009. “Of fevered archives and the quest for total documentation.” In Practice-as-research in performance and screen, edited by Ludivine Allegue Fuschini , Baz Kershaw , Simon Jones and Angela Piccini , 34–49. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Rans, Jonathan. 2014. “UAL slides Jonathan Rans, DCC,” accessed 12 April 2017. ualresearchdata.myblog.arts.ac.uk/files/2014/07/UAL-slides-rans.pptx.
Reason, Matthew. 2010. The young audience: exploring and enhancing children’s experiences of theatre. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
Schwab, Michael , and Henk Borgdorff , eds. 2014. The exposition of artistic research: publishing art in academia. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
Studdert-Kennedy, Michael , and Louis Goldstein . 2002. “Launching language: the gestural origin of discreet infinity.” In Language evolution, edited by Morton Christiansen and Simon Kirby , 235–254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Thomaidis, Konstantinos . 2015. “The re-vocalisation of logos?: thinking, doing and disseminating voice.” In Voice studies: critical approaches to process, performance and experience, edited by Konstantinos Thomaidis and Ben Macpherson , 10–21. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
United States Office of Budget Management . 1999. “Circular A-110 revised 11/19/93 as further amended 9/30/99,” accessed 4 February 2016.

Choreographic practice-as-research

Blades, H. 2015. Affective traces in virtual spaces, Performance Research, 20.6, 26–34.
Bolt, B. 2007. The magic is in handling. In: Barrett, E. and Bolt, B. (eds.). Practice as Research – Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris.
Fernandes, C. and Jürgens, S. 2013. Video annotation in the TKB project: Linguistics meets choreography meets technology. International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media, 9.1, 113–132.
Fernandes, C. and Jürgens, S. 2016. Moving from an artist-led practice into self-emerging educational approaches, Performance Research, 21.6, 71–77.
Forsythe, W. 1997. Improvisation Technologies: A Tool for the Analytical Dance Eye [CD-ROM and booklet]. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag.

Gale, M.S. and Featherstone, A. 2011. The imperative of the archive: Creative archive research. In: Kershaw, B. and Nicholson, H. (eds.). 2011. Research Methods in Theatre and Performance. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Hansen, P. and House, C. 2015. Scoring the generating principles of performance systems, Performance Research, 20.6, 65–73.
Haseman, B. 2007. Rupture and recognition: Identifying the performative research paradigm. In: Barrett, E. and Bolt, B. (eds.). Practice as Research – Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris.
Jürgens, S. 2013. Transmedia choreography: Integrating multimodal video annotation in the creative process of a social robotics performance piece, BST – Body, Space & Technology Journal, Brunel University, UK, 12.1. Available from: http://people.brunel.ac.uk/bst/vol1201/
Jürgens, S. , Henriques, F. and Fernandes, C. 2016. Re-constructing the choreographic studio of João Fiadeiro through animated infographic films, PARtake: The Journal of Performance as Research, 1.1. Available from: scholar.colorado.edu/partake/vol1/iss1/3/
Klein, G. (ed.). 2015. Choreographischer Baukasten. Das Buch. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
Lampert, F. 2007. Tanzimprovisation. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
Lepecki, A. 2006. Exhausting Dance – Performance and the Politics of Movement. London and New York: Routledge.
Lepecki, A. 2010. The body as archive: Will to re-enact and the afterlives of dances, Dance Research Journal, 42.2, 28–48.
McCormack, D. P. 2014. Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
Piccini, A. and Rye, C. 2009. Of fevered archives and the quest for total documentation. In: L. Allegue , S. Jones , B. Kershaw and A. Piccini (eds.). Practice-as-Research in Performance and Screen. London and New York: Palgrave McMillan.
Spatz, B. 2015. What a Body Can Do – Technique as Knowledge, Practice as Research. London and New York: Routledge.
Sullivan, G. 2006. Research acts in art practice, Studies in Art Education, 48.1, 19–35.
Wagenbach, M. and Pina Bausch Foundation (eds.). 2014. Inheriting Dance: An Invitation From Pina. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Resonance in the steps of Rubicon

Arlander, Annette. 2014. ‘Vad minns träden? – What Do the Trees Remember?’. In Dance as Critical Heritage: Archives, Access, Action. Symposium Report 1. Beginnings, edited by Meskimmon, Marsha , von Rosen , Astrid, Sand , Monica , 86–89. Critical Heritage Studies (CHS). Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg Press.
Augé, Marc. 2002 [1986]. In the metro. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Augoyard, Jean-François and Torgue, Henry. 2006. Sonic Experience: A Guide to Everyday Sounds. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
Bacon, Julie Louise . 2013. ‘Unstable Archives: Languages and Myths of the Visible’. In Performing Archives, Archives of Performance, edited by Borggren, Gunhild and Gade, Rune , 73–91. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
Bell, Catherine. 2009. Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Berner, Bodil. 2008. ‘Working Knowledge as Performance: On the Practical Understanding of Machines’. Work, Employment and Society, 22(2): 319–336.
Cardiff, Janet and Schaub, Mirjam. 2005. The Walk Book. Köln: Walther König Verlag.
Cresswell, Tim. 1996. In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Grosz, Elizabeth. 1995. Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies. New York: Routledge.
Jonsved, Elisabet. 2009. Move Your Ass and Your Mind Will Follow: samtidskonstens pedagogiska potential genom en undersökande metod. BA thesis. Stockholm: Konstfack.
Lefebvre, Henri. 2004. Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday life. London: Continuum.

Meskimmon, Marsha . (forthcoming) 2017. ‘Art Matters: Feminist Corporeal-Materialist Aesthetics’. In The Companion to Feminist Art Practice and Theory, edited by Robinson, Hilary and Buszek, Maria Elena . Oxford: Blackwell.
Meskimmon, Marsha , von Rosen , Astrid, Sand , Monica (eds.). 2014. Dance as Critical Heritage: Archives, Access, Action. Symposium Report 1. Beginnings. Critical Heritage Studies (CHS). Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg Press.
O’Rourke, Karen. 2013. Walking and Mapping: Artists as Cartographers. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Sand, Monica. 2008. Konsten att gunga. Experiment som aktiverar mellanrum. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm: Axl books.
Sand, Monica (ed.). 2015. A Vibrating Research. Memory Collage. Report II: https://vimeo.com/144635774 (accessed 10.12.2016).
Sand, Monica and Atienza, Ricardo. 2012. ‘Playing the Space: Resonance, Improvisations and Variations of Urban Ambiences’. In Ambiances in Action/Ambiances en acte(s) – International Congress on Ambiances, edited by Thibaud, Jean-Paul and Siret, Daniel , 153–158. Montreal, Canada: International Ambiances Network.
Sassen, Saskia. 2006. ‘Public Interventions: The Shifting Meaning of the Urban Condition’. Hybrid Space, Open No 11. http://archivepublic.wordpress.com/texts/saskia-sassen/ (accessed 10.10.2016).
Schneider, Rebecca. 2012. ‘Performance Remains’. In Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History, edited by Jones, Amelia and Heathfield, Adrian, 147–150. London: Intellect.
Schultz, Laura Luise. 2013. ‘The Archive is Here and Now: Reframing Political Events as Theatre’. In Performing Archives, Archives of Performance, edited by Borggren, Gunhild and Gade, Rune , 199–219. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
Solnit, Rebecca. 2002. Wanderlust: A History of Walking. London: Verso.
von Rosen, Astrid. 2014. ‘Dansa med bilder. Att artikulera kroppens kunskap i livsberättelser om dans’. In Personligt talat. Biografiska perspektiv i humaniora, edited by Sjöberg, Maria . Göteborg: Makadam.
von Rosen , Astrid, Sand , Monica, Meskimmon , Marsha . (forthcoming) 2017. ‘Transversal Dances Across Time and Space: Feminist Strategies for a Critical Heritage Studies’. In Gender and Heritage, edited by Grahn, Wera and Wilson, Ross J. London: Routledge.
Zukin, Sharon. 2011. Naked City: Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Violence and performance research methods

Anderson, Patrick . 2010. So Much Wasted: Hunger, Performance, and the Morbidity of Resistance. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Anderson, Patrick , and Jisha Menon . 2011. Violence Performed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Appadurai, Arjun . 1996. Modernity at Large. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Appadurai, Arjun . 2002. “Deep Democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics.” Public Culture 14(1): 21–47.
Austin, J.L. 2007. “How to Do Things with Words.” In The Performance Studies Reader. Edited by Henry Bial . New York and London: Routledge.
Benjamin, Walter . 2005. Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings: Part 1 1927–1930. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Butler, Judith . 2004. “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution.” In The Performance Studies Reader, 187–199. Edited by Henry Bial . New York and London: Routledge.
Cacho, Lisa Marie . 2012. Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected. New York: New York University Press.
Chen, Mel Y. 2012. Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
Dillon, Elizabeth Maddock . 2014. New World Drama: The Performative Commons in the Atlantic World. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fanon, Frantz . 2007. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press.
Grosfoguel, Ramon . 2013. “The Structure of Knowledge in Westernized Universities: Epistemic Racism/Sexism and the Four Genocides/Epistemicides of the Long 16th Century.” Human Architecture 1: 73–90. Print.
Hartman, Saidiya V. 1997. Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Holland, Sharon Patricia . 2002. Raising the Dead: Readings of Death and (Black) Subjectivity. Durham. NC: Duke University Press.
Kershaw, Baz . 2009. “Practice as Research Through Performance.” In Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in Creative Arts, 105–123. Edited by Hazel Smith . Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Kershaw, Baz and Helen Nicholson . 2011. Research Methods in Theatre and Performance. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Moten, Fred . 2009. “The Case of Blackness.” Criticism 50(2): 177–218.
Musser, Amber Jamilla . 2014. Sensational Flesh: Race, Power, and Masochism. New York: New York University Press.
Noland, Carrie . 2009. Agency and Embodiment: Performing Gestures/Producing Culture. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Patterson, Orlando . 1982. Slavery and Social Death. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Ramos, Iván A. 2016. “The Viscosity of Grief: Teresa Margolles at the Scene of the Crime.” Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory 25(3): 298–314. Web.
Ritskes, Eric . 2015. “The Fleshy Excess of Black Life: Mike Brown, Eric Garner and Tamir Rice.” The Black Scholar 43(4): 124–131.
Roach, Joseph . 1996. Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance. New York: Columbia University Press.
Sandoval, Chela . 2000. Methodology of the Oppressed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
Spatz, Ben . 2015. What a Body Can Do. London: Routledge.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty . 2014. “Preface to Concerning Violence: Nine Scenes from the Anti-Imperialistic Self-Defense. Film Quarterly 68(1): 61–62.
Taylor, Diana . 2003. The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Taylor, Diana . 1997. Disappearing Acts: Spectacles of Gender and Nationalism in Argentina’s ‘Dirty War’. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
Weheliye, Alexander G. 2014. Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Young, Harvey . 2010 . Embodying Black Experience: Stillness, Critical Memory, and the Black Body. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Introduction to future concerns: Multiple futures of performance as research?

Allegue, Ludivine , Simon Jones , Baz Kershaw , Angela Piccini (eds.). 2009. Practice-as-Research in Performance and Screen. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Arlander, Annette . 2011. “Characteristics of Visual and Performing Arts.” In Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson (eds.). The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 315–332.
Arlander, Annette . 2014. “Om metoder i konstnärlig forskning/On methods of artistic research.” In Torbjörn Lind (ed.). Metod – Process – Redovisning Konstnärlig Forksning Årsbok 2014 / Method – Process – Reporting Artistic Research Yearbook 2014. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet/Swedish Research Council 2014, pp. 13–25/26–39. https://publikationer.vr.se/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/–rsbok-KF-2014-pdf-hela-boken.pdf
Arlander, Annette . 2016. “Artistic Research and/as Interdisciplinarity – Investigação em Arte e/como Interdisciplinaridade.” In Catarina Almeida and Andre Alves (eds.). Artistic Research

Does #1. NEA/12ADS Porto: Research Group in Arts Education/Research Institute in Art, Design, Society; FBAUP Faculty of Fine Arts University of Porto, pp. 1–27.
Aston, Elaine . 2007. “Knowing Differently: Practice as Research and the Women’s Writing for Performance Project.” Nordic Theatre Studies, 19, pp. 9–17.
Auslander, Philip. September 2006. “The Performativity of Performance Documentation.” Performing Arts Journal, 28(3), pp. 1–10.
Baker, Bob and Paula Crabtree , Tamiko O-Brien , Simon Saiz Ruiz . 2006. “Tuning template for Fine Art Higher Education in Europe.” Second draft. Art, Engagement & Education, ELIA (European League of Institutes of the Arts) conference, Gent, Belgium 25,–28.10.2006.
Barone, Tom and Elliot W. Eisner . 2012. Arts Based Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Barrett, Estelle 2010. “Introduction.” In Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds.). Practice as Research – Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 1–13.
Barrett, Estelle . 2014. “Introduction: Extending the Field: Invention, Application and Innovation in Creative Arts Enquiry.” In Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds.). Material Inventions: Applying Creative Arts Research. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 1–21.
Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt (eds.). 2010. Practice as Research – Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris.
Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt (eds.). 2014. Material Inventions: Applying Creative Arts Research. London: I.B. Tauris.
Biernacki, Richard . 1999. “Method and Metaphor After the New Cultural History.” In Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt (eds.). Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Biggs, Michael and Henrik Karlsson . 2011. “Evaluating Quality in Artistic Research.” In Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson (eds.). The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 405–424.
Bolt, Barbara. 2008. “A Performative Paradigm for the Creative Arts?” Working Papers in Art and Design. Volume 5.
Bolt, Barbara . 2014. “Beyond Solipsism in Artistic Research: The Artwork and The Work of Art.” In Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds.). Material Inventions: Applying Creative Arts Research. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 22–37.
Bolt, Barbara . 2016. “Artistic Research: A Performative Paradigm?” PARSE Journal, 3, pp. 129–142.
Borgdorff, Henk . 2006. The Debate on Research in the Arts. Sensuous Knowledge: Series Focus on Artistic Research and Development 2/06.
Bergen, Norway : Kunsthögskolen i Bergen . Borgdorff, Henk . 2012. The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
Conquergood, Dwight . 2004. “Performance Studies, Interventions and Radical Research.” In Bial (ed.). The Performance Studies Reader. London and New York: Routledge.
Cull, Laura . 2014. “Performance Philosophy – Staging a New Field.” In Laura Cull and Alica Lagay (eds.). Encounters in Performance Philosophy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 15–38.
Davis, Tracy C. 2008. “Introduction: The Pirouette, Detour, Revolution, Deflection, Deviation, Tack and Yaw of the Performative Turn.” In Tracy C. Davis (ed.). Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–8.
Elkins, James (ed.). 2009. Artists with PhDs – On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing.
Fischer-Lichte, Erika . 2008. Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics. London and New York: Routledge.
Freeman, John. 2010. Blood, Sweat and Theory – Research Through Practice in Performance. Faringdon: Libri Publishing.
Frodeman, Robert . 2014. Sustainable Knowledge: A Theory of Interdisciplinarity. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gibbons, Michael , Camille Limoges , Helga Nowotny , Simon Schwartzman , Peter Scott and Martin Trow . 1994. The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Hannula, Mika , Juha Suoranta and Tere Vadén . 2005. Artistic Research – Theories, Methods and Practices. Helsinki, Finland and Gothenburg, Sweden: Academy of Fine Arts, University of Gothenburg.

Haseman, Brad . 2006. “A Manifesto for Performative Research.” Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy: Quarterly Journal of Media Research and Resources, 118, pp. 98–106.
Haseman, Brad . 2010. “Rupture and Recognition. Identifying the Performative Research Paradigm.” In Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds.). Practice as Research – Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 147–157.
Kershaw, Baz . 2008. “Performance as research: live events and documents.” In Tracy C. Davis (ed.). Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 23–45.
Kershaw, Baz and Helen Nicholson (eds.). 2011. Research Methods in Theatre and Performance. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Leavy, Patricia . 2009. Method Meets Art – Arts-Based Research Practice. New York: The Guilford Press.
Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Denzin, Norman K. (eds.) 2003. Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
Macleod, Katy and Lin Holridge (eds.). 2006. Thinking Through Art – Reflections on Art as Research. London and New York: Routledge.
Mckenzie, Jon , Heike Roms and C.J. Wan-Ling Wee (eds.). 2010. Contesting Performance – Globals Sites of Research. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Nelson, Robin (ed.). 2013. Practice as Research in the Arts – Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
PARtake Journal of Performance as Research. www.partakejournal.org Peters, Sibylle . 2010. “The Performance Research. A Report from Germany.” In Jon Mckenzie , Heike Roms and C.J. Wan-Ling Wee (eds.). Contesting Performance – Globals Sites of Research. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 153–167.
Porkola, Pilvi . 2014. Esitys Tutkimuksena: Näkökulmia poliittiseen, dokumentaariseen ja henkilökohtaiseen esitystaiteessa. [Performance as Research] Acta Scenica 40. Helsinki: University of the Arts Helsinki, Theatre Academy.
Riley, Shannon Rose and Lynette Hunter (eds.). 2009. Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research – Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schechner, Richard . 2006. Performance Studies – An Introduction, 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
Smith, Hazel and Roger T. Dean (eds.). 2009. Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Varto, Juha . 2009. Basics of Artistic Research: Ontological, Epistemological and Historical Justifications. University of Art and Design, Helsinki Publication B 94. Helsinki: Gummerus.
von Hantelmann, Dorothea . 2014. The Experiential Turn. Living Collections Catalogue. Walker Art Centre. https://walkerart.org/collections/publications/performativity/experiential-turn/ (Accessed 24 October 2017).